

CANON MURATORIANUS

S. P. TREGELLES

*Toronto University Library*  
*Presented by*

*University of Oxford*  
*through the Committee formed in*  
*The Old Country*  
*to aid in replacing the loss caused by*  
*The disastrous Fire of February the 14<sup>th</sup> 1890*





Bib. Lit  
C.

*Canon Muratorianus*

# CANON MURATORIANUS

THE EARLIEST CATALOGUE

OF THE

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

EDITED WITH NOTES

And a Facsimile of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan

BY

SAMUEL PRIDEAUX TREGELLES, LL. D.

ὁ τε γὰρ γνοὺς καὶ μὴ σαφῶς διδάξας ἐν ἴσῳ καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐνεθυμήθη.

Thucydides ii. 60.

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M. DCCC. LXVII.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.




PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF

Oxford

IN acknowledging the kindness of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press in undertaking the publication of this Volume, I have to mention that it is known, I believe, by those to whom any apology may seem due, that the delay as to its appearance has been caused by circumstances wholly beyond my control.

S. P. T.

*November 15, 1867.*



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2012 with funding from  
University of Toronto

# CONTENTS.

## PART I.

	Page
§ 1. THE publication of the Catalogue by Muratori . . . . .	1
Wieseler's description of the document, <i>note</i> . . . . .	1
History of the MS., and part of the contents . . . . .	2, 3
Original language Greek . . . . .	4
§ 2. Criticisms of others on the Muratorian Canon: Mosheim, Stosch, Simon de Magistris, Bunsen . . . . .	4, 5
§ 3. Re-collations and Re-examinations: Nott, Wieseler, Hertz . . .	5
Later Criticisms: Routh, Bunsen, Credner, Van Gilse, Westcott, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar . . . . .	6
§ 4. Tregelles's facsimile . . . . .	7
Thiersch's peculiar doubts, <i>note</i> . . . . .	7
Ceriani's aid . . . . .	8

### APPENDIX TO PART I.

A. Muratori's description of the Ambrosian MS. and its contents .	11
B. Works on the Muratorian Canon . . . . .	14

## PART II.

§ 1. The Muratorian Canon line for line . . . . .	17
§ 2. The following passage in the MS. from St. Ambrose, as given twice, with collations . . . . .	21
§ 3. Mr. Westcott's remarks on the writing of the MS. . . . .	24

## PART III.

§ 1. On the contents of the Fragment . . . . .	29
§ 2. St. Mark's Gospel . . . . .	29
§ 3. St. Luke's Gospel . . . . .	30
§ 4. St. John's Gospel . . . . .	32
Its history and origin: Clement, Jerome . . . . .	34
Victorinus Petavionensis . . . . .	35

	Page
§ 5. Mutual relation of the Gospels . . . . .	35
§ 6. St. John's first Epistle . . . . .	37
John as an eye-witness. Greek order of the Gospels . . . . .	38
§ 7. Acts of the Apostles. Jerome quoted . . . . .	39
Eusebius. Roman character of the Fragment . . . . .	40
St. Peter's martyrdom. Tertullian, Caius, Dionysius . . . . .	41
§ 8. St. Paul's Epistles, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans . . . . .	41
Old Testament citations mostly in the Romans . . . . .	43
§ 9. St. Paul's Epistles to seven Churches . . . . .	43
The Apocalypse of St. John . . . . .	43, 4
Victorinus Petavionensis (A. D. 300), Cyprian . . . . .	45
Catholic Church . . . . .	45
Bede . . . . .	46
§ 10. St. Paul's Epistles to individuals . . . . .	46
§ 11. Epistles falsely ascribed to St. Paul . . . . .	47
To the Laodiceans; to the Alexandrians . . . . .	47
§ 12. Epistles of Jude and John . . . . .	47
§ 13. The Book of Wisdom . . . . .	50
Supposed omission in the Fragment . . . . .	51
Wisdom and Proverbs . . . . .	51
Is Wisdom the work of Philo? Jerome quoted . . . . .	53
Hippolytus quoted, <i>note</i> . . . . .	53
Irenaeus and Eusebius on the book of Wisdom . . . . .	54
Opinion of Bishop Fitzgerald, <i>note</i> . . . . .	54
Early traces of the book. Clement of Rome . . . . .	55
§ 14. Apocalypses of John and Peter . . . . .	56
Early citations from the so-called Apocalypse of Peter. Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	56
Methodius. Hippolytus, <i>note</i> . . . . .	57
§ 15. Hermas and the Shepherd . . . . .	58
Date of the Muratorian Fragment . . . . .	58
Hermas used by Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	59
Supposition of Origen as to the authorship . . . . .	59
Rejected by Tertullian: Eusebius and Jerome . . . . .	60
Testimonies as to its date . . . . .	61
Commendations on the work as a fiction . . . . .	62
Discovery of the Greek Text . . . . .	63
Recent discoveries. Hypereides, Philosophumena of Hippolytus, &c. . . . .	63
The MS. of Hippolytus. Dr. Routh on the authorship, <i>note</i> . . . . .	63
§ 16. Certain writings of Heretics . . . . .	64
Conclusion of the Fragment . . . . .	65

PART IV.

The Relation of the Muratorian Canon to other Authorities of the  
Second Century.

	Page
§ 1. This Canon a centre-point for other testimonies . . . . .	66
§ 2. The Gospels . . . . .	67
Used everywhere at the close of the second century . . . . .	67
Irenaeus quoted . . . . .	68
Justin Martyr on the use of the Gospels . . . . .	70
What Gospels did Justin use? . . . . .	72
St. John's Gospel . . . . .	73
Papias on Mark and Matthew . . . . .	73
Irenaeus on the authorship of the Gospels . . . . .	74
Mark identified with "John whose surname was Mark" . . . . .	75
Metaphors changed into facts . . . . .	76
Eusebius on the early use of the Gospels . . . . .	77
Heretical testimonies to the Gospels . . . . .	78
Heathen testimony: Celsus . . . . .	79
§ 3. St. John's first Epistle . . . . .	81
Irenaeus, &c. Polycarp, Papias, &c. . . . .	81
§ 4. Book of Acts . . . . .	82
Polycarp. Clement of Rome . . . . .	82
§ 5. St. Paul's Epistles . . . . .	82
Tertullian . . . . .	83
Justin Martyr . . . . .	84
Clement of Rome on 1 Cor. Dionysius of Corinth . . . . .	85
Clement's use of Romans. Polycarp . . . . .	86
Bentley's Correspondence, <i>note</i> . . . . .	87
§ 6. Epistles of Jude and John . . . . .	88
Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria on Jude . . . . .	88
Irenaeus on 2 John: Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	89
3 John in the Clementine Homilies . . . . .	89
§ 7. The Apocalypse. Papias, Justin Martyr . . . . .	89
Melito. Dionysius of Corinth . . . . .	90
Irenaeus on the date and authorship . . . . .	90
Clement of Alexandria. Tertullian . . . . .	90
Testimony from four Apocalyptic Churches, <i>note</i> . . . . .	90

PART V.

The Books not mentioned in the Muratorian Canon.

§ 1. Hebrews . . . . .	92
Authorship the only real question . . . . .	92

	Page
Used by Clement of Rome . . . . .	92
Jerome on Clement and Hebrews, <i>note</i> . . . . .	92
Justin Martyr. Irenaeus . . . . .	94
Clement of Alexandria asserts Paul to be the author . . . . .	94
Tertullian ascribes it to Barnabas . . . . .	94
Hippolytus's use of Hebrews . . . . .	95
Origen on the authorship: how far Pauline . . . . .	96
Its place in the order of books . . . . .	96
Later traces of a belief that Barnabas was the writer . . . . .	97
§ 2. First Epistle of St. Peter . . . . .	97
Papias, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	97
Tertullian in his <i>Scorpiace</i> . . . . .	98
§ 3. Second Epistle of St. Peter . . . . .	99
Firmilianus . . . . .	99
Origen, Eusebius . . . . .	100
Hippolytus, Theophilus of Antioch . . . . .	101
Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Pseudo-Barnabas . . . . .	101
Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Melito . . . . .	102
Sibylline Books, <i>note</i> . . . . .	104
Silence of Tertullian . . . . .	104
Pamphilus (in Euthalius) . . . . .	104
Grounds of objection, internal . . . . .	105
Internal proofs of genuineness . . . . .	105
Clementine Homilies, <i>note</i> . . . . .	106
Style . . . . .	106
Later portion of Isaiah sanctioned as his in the New Testament, <i>note</i> . . . . .	107
Moral arguments for 2 Pet. . . . .	107
Was the Apocalypse of Peter a false substitute for his second Epistle? . . . . .	108
§ 4. The Epistle of James . . . . .	108
Origen, Irenaeus . . . . .	108
Hermas, Dionysius of Alexandria . . . . .	109
§ 5. The New Testament in the fourth century . . . . .	109
Diocletian persecution . . . . .	109
Traditors . . . . .	110
Assertions used against the New Testament . . . . .	111
Objections to St. John's Gospel, <i>note</i> . . . . .	111
Importance of Historic Evidence . . . . .	111

## CORRIGENDA.

P. 45, l. 16, *for* A. D. 200 *read* A. D. 300.

P. 62, l. 9, *for* his veniens *read* hic veniens.

# ERRATUM.

P. 39, line 5, should stand thus

*euidenter declarat. Sed et projectionem pauli ab ur*



# CANON MURATORIANUS.

## PART I.

§ 1. IN the year 1740 Muratori published a document containing an early list of the books of the New Testament from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan<sup>a</sup>. This document is anonymous, and from the subject and the name of the Editor it is generally known and quoted as the Muratorian Canon or Muratorian Fragment. The internal evidence proves it to be the work of a writer who had lived in the middle of the second century; and hence in all inquiries on the subject of the Canon of the New Testament this list has an especial value, for it is the earliest definite statement of the kind in existence. It is not a formal catalogue of the New Testament books, but it rather appears to be an incidental account given by the writer, who for some reason had occasion to speak of the subject in this particular manner. Most who have treated on the Canon from the time of Muratori appear to have agreed as to the importance of the document (except, perhaps, a few who paradoxically expressed some doubt as to its genuineness), and some have endeavoured to give its text with greater exactitude than was done by Muratori. This might be thought to be a matter of no difficulty; but in fact the discrepancies of collators have been most strange; some affirming that the beginning of the document is in the middle of a page after a vacant space<sup>b</sup>, others correctly stating that the truncated commencement is at the top of a page, so that the defect in that part may be owing to the loss of a preceding leaf. There were several questions which could only be set at rest by obtaining a

<sup>a</sup> In the third vol. of his *Antiquitates Italiae Medii Aevi*, &c. The whole of Muratori's account of this document, and of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library in which it is contained, is given at the end of this Part, p. 11.

<sup>b</sup> Thus Prof. F. Wieseler says, "Das Frag-

ment fängt nach einer längern Lücke etwa mitten auf der Seite an." It is scarcely possible to compress greater errors into fewer words. But this statement has been repeated and fully credited; while the bearing of such an assertion is of no little moment as to the beginning of the document.

facsimile of that part of this Ambrosian MS.; and to give this is the object of the present publication.

Accuracy of statement of all points of Christian evidence is of no small importance, if we wish to rise from a mere general and indefinite notion to a clear and distinct apprehension of facts. And as Christianity is a religion based on facts, we have to inquire on what grounds we receive the documents in which such facts are transmitted; for thus we shall know how to meet those who would throw distrust or suggest doubt as to this branch of Christian evidence. It behoves us to know how, from the Apostolic age and onward, there never has been a time in which the historic records of our religion have not been received, held fast, and publicly used; so that all along there have been the same records as to the facts of our Lord's incarnation, His death on the cross as the vicarious sacrifice appointed by God the Father, His resurrection, ascension, the mission of the Holy Ghost, and the preaching by the Apostles of our Lord of the doctrine of repentance and remission of sins in His name, in obedience to His command.

The object of the facsimile of the Canon Muratorianus now published is to give that ancient document in such a form as shall for the future be free from all doubt: the notes are such as appear to me to illustrate the author's meaning and intention, especially as to what he actually wrote; and the testimonies of other writers that are subjoined (Part IV.) are intended as giving a general view of the relation of the Muratorian Canon of the New Testament to the other authorities of the second century, shewing the common reception of our Canonical books in all parts from which we have any extant writings of Christians in that age.

It will be seen that the object of Muratori in publishing this fragment was not so much to illustrate sacred letters, as to exhibit a striking specimen of the barbarism of the scribes in Italy in the ages in which ancient learning had been destroyed. He doubtless intended to give a perfectly faithful transcript; but he evidently found a difficulty (as has been the case with others) in copying with literal accuracy words and sentences containing almost every possible error of grammar and orthography; while other inaccuracies must be regarded as mistakes such as would be almost certain to be introduced while passing through the hands of a printer, and which too often evade the vigilance of a press-corrector. Some of the mistakes and oversights seem to have arisen from the present obscurity of some parts of the MS., especially in the faint corrections.

The volume in which the Muratorian Fragment is contained formerly belonged to the celebrated monastery of Bobbio, a place from which precious MSS. have migrated into so many libraries, thus carrying the name of Bobbio

with them; while that Irish monastery of Columbanus has no remaining literary celebrity as a locality except for the treasures *once* deposited there. Muratori judged, a century and a quarter ago, that the MS. was almost a thousand years old: we may reasonably ascribe it to some part of the eighth century. The prefixed title (as Muratori mentions) attributes, incorrectly enough, the contents of the volume to John Chrysostom. At the beginning it is defective; cap. iv, with which it now commences, contains an extract from Eucherius Lugdunensis; then follows this fragment on the Canon: this is comprized in the two sides of folio 10, and in the first twenty-three lines of the recto of folio 11; while the rest of folio 11 and the recto of folio 12 contain *twice over* an extract from St. Ambrose (in ed. Benedict. Paris 1686, 287, 8). This portion out of St. Ambrose is passed over by Muratori, who speaks of what follows this extract as if it had immediately succeeded the fragment on the Canon. The rest of the very varied collection contained in the book may be seen in Muratori's description.

It seems as if it must have been a kind of common-place book, in which some monk, possessed of more industry than learning or critical tact, had written out various things which came in his way, without his having any definite reason in his selections, and without there being any relation between the things so brought together. Many, however, of the astonishing mistakes found in the fragments did not *originate* with him, though he may perhaps have increased them, partly from ignorance, and partly from that frequent cause of the corruption of ancient texts—the attempt at emendation.

The fragment on the Canon is defective at the beginning, and this appears to be from the loss of leaves, perhaps one quire, between what are now the first and second.

We may certainly gather that what preceded in the MS. must have related to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark; but *how* the whole statement relative to the books of the New Testament was introduced, and for what purpose written, can only be a matter of conjecture. The writer seems to have had *some* object in view, some point that he wished to establish, some error before him that he wished to controvert. Thus much seems evident, that he does not make a formal objective statement, but that he only introduces what he has to say on the books of the New Testament and their authors, *subjectively*, as bearing on the points, whatever they might be, that he had under discussion.

The fragment terminates abruptly; but we have all that the scribe of the eighth century saw fit to insert in his common-place book: this fact seemed uncertain so long as there was any doubt as to the manner in

which it ends. It may have had but a fragmentary termination when it fell into the hands of the monk of Bobbio.

Muratori, on grounds which he gives in his description, ascribes this fragment to the Roman Presbyter Caius, about the year A. D. 196: an opinion hardly to be reconciled with the fact which the writer states, that Pius was bishop of Rome in his time: "the date of the Episcopate of Pius is variously given, 127-142 and 142-157<sup>c</sup>." Others place his death 150.

That it was originally written in Greek, and that some of the mistakes in the Ambrosian copy are those of a translator, was of course the opinion of Muratori in supposing Caius to be the author. But the Greek original is a point wholly irrespective of any opinion as to the authorship.

§ 2. It was only natural that some attention should soon have been directed to so curious a monument of Christian antiquity, bearing as it does such an important relation to the evidence for the Canon of the New Testament.

The names of those who have discussed the Muratorian Fragment are sufficient proof of this attention: most, however, contented themselves with repeating the text from Muratori, and either dismissing the subject with a few remarks, or else disproving the theory that Caius was the author, and perhaps expressing an opinion whether it was originally written in Latin or Greek.

Thus Mosheim, in 1753, spoke of the dubiousness of the notion of the authorship, which had been suggested by the first editor; and that on the simple ground of the writer having been the contemporary of Hermas, and thus being of about the middle, and not the end, of the second century.

Stosch, in 1755, equally rejected the opinion that Caius had been the author; but he also denied its Greek original, and sought to explain the document on the supposition that it had been originally written in Latin.

In 1772, Simon de Magistris, in editing *Daniel secundum LXX ex codice Chisiano*, in the dissertations subjoined, attributed the authorship to Papias of Hierapolis (p. 467); he rightly saw that Greek was the original

Westcott's *History of the Canon of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. 1865 (p. 185). On the ground above stated, and others, such as the heterodoxies mentioned, the Fragment is not unreasonably supposed to be not later than the year 170, or probably earlier.

The question of date makes it *improbable* that it *can* be the work of Caius; although there are not wanting instances of literary activity

through different parts of a very long period. Dr. Routh's edition of the *Euthydemus* and *Gorgias* of Plato appeared in 1784; his *Tres breves Tractatus* exactly seventy years afterwards, in 1854. But the rarity of such a circumstance makes the difficulty of ascribing this Fragment to Caius very manifest, as does the context of the passage which speaks of Pius as living in his time.

language, and that the Ambrosian copy is simply a translation; but in supposing Papias to have been the author, he was almost, if not quite, as incorrect in his chronology, by placing it too early, as Muratori had been in placing it too late.

Most of those who have discussed the Fragment have been content with regarding it as being like the Epistle to Diognetus, one of the early Christian monuments of the authorship of which we know nothing. And this in the absence of all evidence is the only course to be adopted if we would avoid speculation. The late Baron Bunsen, in his *Analecta Antea-Nicaena* (i. 125, &c.), in publishing this Fragment, ascribes it to Hegesippus<sup>d</sup>. That he lived at the same time as the author of this Fragment we know; but this in itself *proves* nothing, as Bunsen truly states: but he tries to find some confirmation of his conjecture from the manner in which Eusebius and Jerome speak of Hegesippus and his mode of using sacred books. All that can be said, I think, in favour of Bunsen's hypothesis is, that it is not, like those of Muratori and Simon de Magistris, contradicted by facts: it does not involve any actual impossibility.

§ 3. For a long time the text of the Fragment was only known from the edition of Muratori, although it might have been thought probable that in a document of so peculiar a kind some of the obscure words would admit of a re-examination being made with advantage. A collation of Muratori's text with the MS. itself was made by GEORGE FREDERIC NOTT, who communicated the results to Dr. Routh, who after the collator's death inserted them in the second edition of his *Reliquiae Sacrae* (1846). In 1847 another collation was made by Prof. FRIEDRICH WIESELER, which was published by his brother, Prof. Karl Wieseler, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for that year. In 1847 also M. HERTZ made the collation used by Baron Bunsen in his edition.

Some of those who endeavoured to ascertain the true reading of the Fragment did so, as assuming that the Latin is the original, and thus all

<sup>d</sup> He had first done this in the announcement which appeared at the end of his *Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit. Sieben Sendschriften an Dr. August Neander, Hamburg 1847*. In the *Nachschrift*, p. 244, he expresses his hope of publishing in the same year *Marcion und Hegesippus oder der Brief an Diognet und das muratorische Bruchstück über den Canon, &c.*

Credner (*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanon*, pp. 142, 3) thus discusses the theory which ascribes the authorship to Hegesippus: "Just as untenable as is Muratori's supposition

that the Presbyter Caius is the author, so also is Bunsen's opinion, according to which the Fragment is taken out of Hegesippus's Five Books of *ὑπομνήματα*. . . Hegesippus himself did not abide by this Canon, but used the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Eusebius H. E. iv. 22). . . Eusebius, who so highly honoured Hegesippus (H. E. iv. 8), and had a full acquaintance with his *ὑπομνήματα*, surely would not in his inquiry for lists of the Canon have omitted to insert this list in his *Ecclesiastical History* had it been found in Hegesippus."

that could be needed was the critical correction of the existing document ; while others, believing that the original was Greek, sought to understand the Ambrosian MS. by means in part of what such Greek original must have been. Routh says :—" Ego ex vestigiis satis claris deprehendisse mihi videor hominem, qui Graece scripserit, subter haec Latina verba latentem, eo indicio quod eadem ita graecissant, ut etiam ex illa lingua reddita esse videantur." (Rel. Sac. i. 402.) These remarks are in opposition to Freind-aller, who, while he revived the hypothesis of Muratori that Caius was the author, said also " Fragmentum nostrum Latinae potius originis stylum sapit."

Dr. Routh's notes on the Fragment were of more importance for the illustration of the writer's meaning than those of all who had preceded him ; as such they have a permanent value, and no one can safely neglect them. Although he fully believed that he had before him a translation from the Greek, yet he did not make the hazardous attempt to restore the original throughout : he contented himself with suggesting in particular passages what the original might probably have been ; for this is sometimes of importance, as leading to the formation of a judgment of what is intended by the Latin which we have.

Baron Bunsen, in his *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*, however, not only attempted the correction of the Latin, but he also gave a reconstruction of the Greek by Boetticher (or Lagarde), which he supposed would answer to it. So too Hilgenfeld in 1863 : but in such attempts failure is almost necessary ; because not only must we be uncertain as to the Greek words, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to make true allowance for the injuries which copyists have inflicted on the Latin version.

Amongst those who have applied their critical acumen to the restoration of the Latin Text, Credner should be especially mentioned, whose notes also are often important ; Van Gilse too should not be overlooked ; and the Rev. B. F. Westcott has skilfully corrected some passages, while regarding others as hopelessly corrupted. Credner in 1847 had said, " The text of our MS. is one corrupted beyond all measure<sup>e</sup> ;" while Dr. G. Volkmar, the editor of his posthumous work, so far from agreeing with this statement, commences his own account of the MS. with the words, " The MS. is so little a corrupt one, that it far rather belongs to the most correct<sup>f</sup>." This statement of Volkmar's has not been without

<sup>e</sup> " Der Text unseres Fragmentes ist ein über alle Maassen verdorbener. Die Schuld dieser Verdorbenheit ist in der gränzlosen Unwissenheit der Abschreiber zu suchen." Zur Geschichte des Canons, p. 72.

<sup>f</sup> " Das MS. ist so wenig ein corruptes, dass es vielmehr zu den correctesten gehört." Volkmar in Credner's Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanon, 1860, p. 341.

profit; for it led Westcott to investigate this very point with the MS. itself at Milan; and thus he established the fact that the inaccuracies of the writer are in the general contents of the volume habitual and astonishing, as Muratori had said.

§ 4. I had long been aware that in several places it was very desirable to re-examine the Muratorian Fragment, so as to remove all doubt as to its readings; and it was important, in my judgment, that this should be done by means of a facsimile tracing, so as to guard against mere errors of the eye; and also because of the MS. being unique; so that without a facsimile it would be impossible satisfactorily to perpetuate the record, in case of any injury befalling the Ambrosian copy. Also I thought that if this were done, the extraordinary doubts thrown out by Thiersch's would of necessity be set at rest. The experience which I had obtained as to collators and copyists of Greek Testament MSS. caused me to feel surprise that no one interested in the subject seemed to have ever examined the MS. since Muratori himself: for although this had been done by Nott, the fact as well as the results were unknown to me; for these were only made public in the second edition of Dr. Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae*, which did not appear till 1846.

When in Italy, from Nov. 1845 till June 1846, I was closely occupied with the collation of Greek MSS., with vain endeavours to gain access to the Vatican MS., so as fully to use it, and with the Latin Codex Amiatinus at Florence; and at that time I could not visit Milan. Had that then been practicable, I should certainly have made some effort for getting then a facsimile tracing of the Fragment<sup>h</sup>.

Not long after that time I was speaking of the value of such a facsimile, when Chevalier Bunsen told me that he had endeavoured to obtain one through some formal diplomatic channel; but that the answer had been, that it could not be permitted; there was such fear of the MS. receiving injury, and that a document of so much value required such peculiar care, &c.: he informed me, however, that he either had obtained or should soon

§ In Thiersch's Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schriften (1845), he discusses (pp. 384-7) the Muratorian Canon. He makes the important remark, "Wir fürchten, Muratori hat es beim Lesen des Manuscripts etwas leicht genommen; damit verbindet sich aber die Hoffnung, dass vermittelt einer neuen Vergleichung desselben noch ein Text gewonnen werden könnte, den man dann als sichere Basis für weitere Emendationen betrachten dürfte" (p. 385). He rightly maintains the

original to have been Greek; but after discussing well the contents of the Fragment, he concludes with throwing a kind of suspicion over the whole: some of the corruptions are (he says) of such a kind, "dass sie uns fast wie ein Scherz vorkommen und schon mehrmals den Verdacht in uns erweckten, ob nicht das ganze Fragment eine spasshafte Mystification des Herausgebers Muratori sein könnte?"

<sup>h</sup> Before that time I had studied the document as edited: indeed my notes on it begin as long ago as 1844.

obtain a very thorough collation of the MS.; which of course is that of Hertz, which he afterwards used.

About this time the second edition of Routh's *Reliquiae* came out, shewing that the transcript published by Muratori and the collation by Nott were not in precise accordance; then in 1847 Karl Wieseler published the collation made by his brother, Friedrich Wieseler, and in 1854 Bunsen published that of Hertz. Of these collations of the MS. Mr. Westcott said, that they, "though slightly inconsistent, leave nothing more to be gained by a fresh examination of its marvellous blunders<sup>i</sup>." It might be allowed that there could not be *much* to gain as to the general meaning and contents; but still where there are discrepancies, it may be permitted that an investigator may know the feeling—

" Nil actum reputans dum quid superesset agendum ;"

and he might judge that something still remained undone so long as the points of difference as to the testimony of collators remained unsettled.

But indeed so long as Wieseler's statement that the MS. begins about the middle of a page remained unanswered<sup>k</sup>, and so long as Thiersch's hint that the whole might be a mystification was uncontradicted, something was still to be done.

During the latter days of August, 1857, I paid a short visit to Milan; and when at the Ambrosian Library, I recollected the Muratorian Canon, and the desire which I had felt in former years to examine it and to make a facsimile tracing. In Signor ANTONIO CERIANI, one of the Doctors of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana (whose Syriac studies have since borne valuable fruit), I found a scholar whose true pleasure in furthering Biblical or Antiquarian inquiry was a real and important aid. He shewed me the volume containing the Fragment, which we examined together, and then we compared it with the transcript of its text, as published by Muratori, its discoverer. We both felt some surprise that such variations should exist in the descriptions of the MS. and not only in the transcript.

Recollecting the failure of Chevalier Bunsen's formal application for a facsimile, it was more with desire than with expectation that I asked Dr. Ceriani if I could be allowed to make a facsimile tracing, (materials for which I had happily with me in Milan); Dr. Ceriani with the greatest promptitude applied to the officer of the Library then in charge, who could grant the needed permission; and with equal kindness and alacrity,

<sup>i</sup> History of the Canon of the New Testament, ed. 1st, 1855, p. 557.

<sup>k</sup> I do not know to which of the brothers such a mis-statement should be attributed,

Friedrich the collator, or Karl the editor; if to the former, it must have been one of those misleading notes, written down from failing memory.

the Librarian in charge, when the object was explained, gave me leave to make the tracing. To this I at once devoted myself; and by making a diligent use of the remainder of that day and of the next (on the evening of which I had to leave Milan), during the hours in which the Library was open, I was able to complete my facsimile, including that part of the passage from St. Ambrose which stands on the same page as the end of the Fragment.

I noticed that this extract from St. Ambrose was given twice, and I examined it sufficiently to see that the two copies had some variations amongst themselves; I also thought that I observed that the peculiarities of transcription, as to orthography, substitutions of letters, &c., resembled those in the Fragment on the Canon; hence I supposed that the comparison of the two copies of the extract from St. Ambrose with the known text would throw some light on its mistakes and strange corruptions. But as I had at once to leave Milan, Dr. Ceriani had the kindness to offer to copy for me this part of the MS., which he soon afterwards sent to me in England.

On my homeward journey I was at Heidelberg on Sept. 7, when I took the opportunity of shewing the facsimile tracing that I had made to the Chevalier Bunsen at Charlottenberg, where he then resided. He was surprised to find that it had been obtained without difficulty; and at once he collated it with me, letter by letter, with the transcript of Hertz. If I had been able at Milan to have compared it with any copy but that of Muratori, I might have found several things in the corrections of later hands noted by Nott, F. Wieseler, or Hertz, to be re-examined at once and verified with the MS. As it was, beginning with any letter or part of a letter which was thus noted by Chevalier Bunsen and myself, I added to my list of queries every point, however minute, which seemed at all doubtful from the other collations; and by sending a tracing of the line or lines in which such queries occurred to Dr. Ceriani, I obtained from him a precise correction (if needed) of what the later hands had added or altered. These minute corrections in the MS. are sometimes very faint, so that as to one Dr. Ceriani had to wait for a day sufficiently clear and cloudless to enable him to see the correction with absolute certainty.

I naturally wished to bring this facsimile before those interested in critical studies: after a while, the Delegates of the Oxford University Press kindly expressed their willingness to do this; the facsimile was placed in the hands of a lithographer at Oxford; when lithographed, I examined it letter by letter with my tracing, and I also sent it to Dr. Ceriani for his approval and revision. I thus feel satisfied that there has been preserved

the true form of the document containing this early Canon in the manner in which it has been transmitted. Its evidence is not the less trustworthy from its being a blundering and illiterate transcript of a rough and rustic translation of a Greek original. The peculiarity of its transmission in this form gives, if anything, a farther weight to its testimony as being something the genuineness of which is self-evident.

The hindrances which interfered with my publishing the facsimile as soon as it had been lithographed, have occasioned a delay which I regret<sup>1</sup>. The failure of health, which for a time put a stop to all work connected with my Greek Testament, of course prevented my doing anything else which required thought and study: I am thankful for the mercy of Almighty God enabling me to go on with my Greek Testament; and now, after several years, I am glad not to allow this facsimile to remain any longer in obscurity. There are, I believe, those to whom it will be useful as supplying a portion of the evidence which bears on the transmission of those Records inspired by the Holy Ghost through which we learn the Revelation which God has given us of His blessed Son.

<sup>1</sup> I ought here to mention, that the original corrected has been transferred by photography, lithograph is not that which has been now and relithographed. published; but the copy which I had finally

quibus tamen interpretatus est et ita posuit.  
Tertio euangelii librum secundum doliucan  
Lucas iste medicus postea uersus uerbi  
Cum eo paulus quasi uirtutis studiosus.  
Secundum adsumsisset nomen suo  
ex opinione concribet. Omnia tamen neclipse  
diuidit in carne. Et de prole sequi potuit.  
Ita et ad natiuitatem iohannis incipit dicere.  
Quarti euangeliorum iohannis ex decipolis  
Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis  
dixit conleuante mihi odie triduo. Et quid  
cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum  
nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte reue  
latum andrea ex apostolis ut recognis  
centibus cunctis iohannis suo nomine  
cuncta describeret. Et ideo licituarum sin  
culis euangeliorum libris principia  
doceantur. Nihil tamen differt creden  
tium fidei cum uno ac principali spiritu de  
claratas sint. In omnibus omnia de natiui  
tate de passione de resurrectione  
de conuersione. Cum discipulis suis  
ac de gemino eius aduentu  
primo in humilitate dispectus quod po  
tius secundum potestate regali. pre  
clarum quod poturum est. quid ergo  
mirum si iohannes tam constanter  
singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat  
dicens in se meipsu. Que uidimus oculis  
nostris et auribus audiimus. Et manus  
nostrae palpa uerunt haec scripsimus.

Sic enim non solum uisorem sed auditorem  
Sed et scriptorem omnium mirabili uerbi perordi  
nem prope tetur. Acta autem omnium apostolorum  
sub uno libro scribitur. Lucas ob time theopi  
le conprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula  
geriebantur. Sicut et semote passionem petri  
euidenter declarat. Sed profectionem pauli ab ur  
be ad spaniam proficiscentis. Epistulae autem  
pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directe  
sint uolentibus intellegere. Ipse declarant.  
Primum omnium corinthis scismatis heresis in  
terdicens deinceps in callatis circumcisione  
Romanis autem ordinem scripturarum sed et  
principium earum. Desse xpm inuicem  
prolextius scripsit de quibus in colis. Nec  
se est ad nobis desputari. Cum ipse beatus  
apostulus paulus sequens prodecessorissui  
iohannis ordinem non nisi comenati. septem  
ecclesie scribat ordinem tali. Ad corinthios  
prima ad efesios secunda ad philippenses ter  
tia ad colosensis quarta ad galatas quin  
ta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta ad romanos  
septima. Uerum corinthis et tensaolenen  
sibus licet pro correptione litteretur. Una  
tamen per omnem orbem terrarum ecclesia  
diffusa esset. Et iohannis exilium na  
pocalebs. Licet septem ecclesie scribat  
tamen omnibus dicit. Uerum ad filemonem una  
et a titum una. Et ad timotheum duas pro affec  
to et dilectione. In honore tamen ecclesiae ca  
tholice in ordinatione ecclesiasticae.

descepline sanctificantes sunt pertinetiam ad  
laudecentes. Alia ad alexandrinum paulino  
minem fincte ad hessem marcionis et alia plu  
ra quae in catholica ecclesia receperunt  
potest felenim cum melle misceri non con  
cruit. Epistolas anelude et superscriptio  
iohannis duas in catholica habentur. Et sapi  
entia ab amicis salomonis in honore ipsius  
scripta apocalypse etiam iohannis et pre  
tritantum recipimus. Quam quidam ex nos  
tris legi in ecclesia nolunt pastorem uero  
nuperrim et temporibus nostris in urbe  
roma herma conscripsit. Sed ente cathe  
dra urbis romae ecclesiae pio episcopus fratrem  
eius et ideo legiemus quidem. Oportet se pu  
blicare uero in ecclesia populo. Neque in ter  
prophetas completum numero. Neque in ter  
apostolos in fine temporum potest.  
Arsinoi autem seu ualentini uel mitiade  
nihil in totum recipimus. Qui etiam noui  
psalmorum librum marcionis conscripse  
runt. Una cum basilide assianum cataphry  
cum constitutorem.  
Abraham nomen dedit seu uolus suos uer  
naculus. Et cum trecentis de ce et octo  
uiris adeptis uictoriam liuerauit ne pote  
pro uatur diuisionis adeptus. Quando sic  
amabat nepotem ut pro eo nec uelli decli  
narum periculum. Quid est nomen dedit. hoc  
est elegit. Unde et illud non solum ad scien  
tiam dei reperitur. Sed etiam ad crania iustorum.

Uridauer Tregeles  
Milan  
Aug. 28. 1857



## APPENDIX TO PART I.

## A.

Muratorii's description of the Ambrosian MS. and its contents, especially the Fragment on the Canon.

De Literarum Statu, neglectu et cultura in Italia post Barbaros in eam invecos usque ad annum Christi Millesimum Centesimum.

Dissertatio Quadragesima Tertia.

(Muratorii Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi etc. Tom. iii. Mediolani MDCCXL. coll. 809-880.)

(851) "Sed quando coepimus vulnera rimari literis inflicta, dum rudia saecula decurrerent, ne hoc quidem dissimulandum est, imperitissimos et indoctissimos homines crebrius quam antea fuisse adhibitos ad exscribendos Codices, quos propterea erroribus ac sordibus ad nauseam usque repletos intueare. Ex his non paucos prae manibus habui, et exemplum adferre juvat, quod non uno nomine, nisi mihi facile blandior, lucem exposcere videtur. Adservat Ambrosiana Mediolanensis Bibliotheca membranaceum Codicem, e Bobiensi acceptum, cujus antiquitas paene ad annos mille accedere mihi visa est. Scriptus enim fuit Literis majusculis et quadratis. Titulus praefixus omnia tribuit Johanni Chrysostomo, sed immerito. Mutilum in principio codicem deprehendi. Cap. IV. est *de animantibus*, atque ex his verbis incipit: *Alae duo testamenta. In Ezechiel unumquodque duabus alis velabat os suum etc.* Horum auctorem agnovi Eucherium Lugdunensem Lib. Formul. Spiritual. Sequitur fragmentum de Apostolis, infra mihi evulgandum. Tum *Incipit de expositionem* (ita ibi) *diversarum rerum. In primis mandragora in Genesi, genus pumi simillimum parvo peponis speciem vel odore etc.* Ita illic depravata sunt verba, excerpta e libro ejusdem Sancti Eucherii de Hebraic. Nomin. Interpret. Post alia sequitur *de Matthaen Evangelista. Orate autem ne fiat fuca vestra hieme vel sabbato; id est ne cum fucu sit, impedimentum patiamini.* Post hanc Homiliam succedit altera *de ultimo adventu Christi*; ubi de mille annis in apocalypsi memoratis agitur. Tum Homiliae in illa verba: *Nemo scit de die et hora illa. De tribus mensuris. De Petro apostolo. De reparatione Lapsi*, quod opusculum novimus tributum Chrysostomo. Additur *Fides Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi*, quae incipit: *Nos Patrem et Filium etc.* sed post aliquot lineas reliqua desiderantur. Accedit altera *Expositio Fidei Catholicae*, cujus auctorem Charta lacerata non retinet. Tum *Fides Sancti Luciferi Episcopi*. Deinde, *Fides quae ex Nicaeno Concilio processit.* Tandem *Incipit Fides Beati Athanasii. Fidis unius substantiae Trinitatis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti etc.* Ex eodem ergo Codice ego decerpsi fragmentum antiquissimum ad Canonem divinarum Scripturarum spectans. Nulli diligentiae peperci, ut ejus auctorem detegerem, simulque rescirem, num hactenus editum fuerit. Nisi me fefellerunt oculi, aut complurium Librorum defectus, quem non semel doleo: nusquam deprehendi evulgatum, ac propterea spes mihi superest,

fore ut libentius a Lectoribus accipiat, ac praecipue quod antiquitatem redoleat summe venerabilem. Si conjecturam meam exerere fas est, in illam opinionem feror, tribuenda haec esse *Cajo Ecclesiae Romanae Presbytero, qui sub Victore et Zephyrino Pontificibus*, teste Photio in Bibliotheca, Codice XLVIII. hoc est qui circiter annum Christi cxcvi. floruit. Disputationem Caji istius *disertissimi viri, habitam Romae temporibus Zephyrini adversus Proclum quemdam Cataphrygaram haeresis propugnatorem*, memorat Eusebius Caesariensis, Ecclesiastic. Histor. Lib. 6. Cap. 20. in qua ille dum adversariorum in componendis novis Scripturis temeritatem et audaciam sugillat τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ Ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μόνων ἐπιστολῶν, μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ Ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν: *tredecim tantum divini Apostoli recenset Epistolas, eam quae ad Hebraeos inscripta est, cum reliquis non adnumerans. Sane haec Epistola etiamnum a quibusdam Romanis apostoli esse non creditur. Sanctus Hieronymus totidem fere verbis, de Cajo isto loquens in Libro de Scriptorib. Ecclesiastic. Cap. 60. reddidit sententiam Eusebii, nisi quod addit, disputationem a Cajo habitam sub Zephyrino Romanae urbis Episcopo, id est sub Antonino Severi filio; ac propterea secundum illum Cajus haec scripserit circiter Annum Vulgaris Epochae ccxii. Addit etiam de eadem Epistola: sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur, quum tamen Eusebius tantum scripserit apud quosdam Romanos. Photius quoque loco supra laudato auctor est, Cajum tredecim duntaxat Beati Pauli Epistolas enumerasse, non recepta in censum quae est ad Hebraeos. Ille quoque haec ab Eusebio hausit. Ceterum non est hujus loci recensere, quibus auctoribus et rationibus in Canonem sacrarum Scripturarum merito recepta deinde ab omnibus fuerit Epistola ad Hebraeos, de qua idem Sanctus Hieronymus ad Evagrium scribens dicit: Quam omnes Graeci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum. Ita quaestionem hanc jam diu versarunt ac illustrarunt viri doctissimi, ut rursus eandem agitare velle, supervacaneum foret.*

“ Illud quod ad me spectat, arripio. Hippolytus quoque Portuensis episcopus, Caji supra laudati aequalis, Photio teste, Codice 121. sensit *Epistolam ad Hebraeos non esse Pauli Apostoli*. Immo ne temporibus quidem Sancti Hieronymi Romana Ecclesia illam inter Canonicas Apostoli Pauli Epistolas receperat. Quum ergo eam omiserit Cajus Presbyter Romanus, Scriptor antiquissimus, ceteras recensens, veri videtur simile, eidem Cajo tribuendum esse fragmentum infra evulgandum, in quo praetermissam plane videas Epistolam ad Hebraeos. Accedit et alterum robustius argumentum. Memorat hic Scriptor celebrem Hermae Librum, titulo *Pastoris* inscriptum, his verbis: *Pastorem verò Nuperrime Temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit, sedenti Cathedrâ urbis Romae Ecclesiae Pio Episcopo fratre ejus*. Jam inter eruditos constat, Hermam floruisse ad dimidium saeculi a Christo nato secundi. Et certe si tunc Romanam Cathedram tenuit Pius I. Papa, illius frater, is Librum *Pastoris* scripsisse dicendus est circiter annum Christi cl. At nos supra vidimus, Cajum Romanum Presbyterum vixisse circiter annum cxcvi. et nihil obstat, quin antea haec scripserit. At quando fragmenti auctor testatur Hermam *Nuperrime Temporibus nostris* Librum *Pastoris* conscripsisse: quemnam opportuniùs quàm eundem Cajum fragmenti ipsius parentem fuisse conjicias? Tandem scribit fragmenti auctor: *Apocalypsim etiam Johannis et Petri, tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesia nolunt*. Recte haec in Caji tempora conveniunt. Eusebius enim lib. 3. cap. 25 *Apocalypsim Petri* inter dubios quidem Libros recenset,

non tamen abiecit veluti Haeticorum foetum. Eodem quoque testante, Clemens Alexandrinus eadem Apocalypsi est usus, non secus ac Epistolâ Barnabae. Sozomenus pariter nos monuit Lib. 7. cap. 19. hanc apocalypsim *in quibusdam Ecclesiis Palaestinae usque adhuc singulis annis semel legi*. Temporibus etiam Caji ipsius circumferebatur Epistola spuria Pauli Apostoli *ad Laodicenses*, a Sancto Hieronymo et Theodoretò explosa, quam Marcion haeresiarcha in subsidium sui delirii adhibuit, uti nos docet Sanctus Epiphanius Haeresi 42. At praeter hanc ex ipso fragmento nunc discimus, alteram Paulo suppositam fuisse, nempe *ad Alexandrinos*, cujus nescio an quisquam alius meminerit. Quum verò *Apocalypsim Pauli*, ab Augustino et Sozomeno memoratam, Scriptor hic nequaquam recenseat, confirmatur sententia Johannis Ernesti Gralii, qui in Spicilegio Patrum pag. 84. censuit erupisse hanc imposturam saeculo dumtaxat Ecclesiae Christianae quarto. Hic quoque videas memorari *Librum Psalmorum* a Valentino Haeresiarcha elaboratum. Unus Tertullianus, quod sciam, Lib. de Carne Christi, cap. 20. istos indicavit, scribens: *nobis quoque ad hanc speciem Psalmi patrocinantur, non quidam Apostatae et Haeretici, et Platonici Valentini, sed sanctissimi et receptissimi Prophetæ David*. Quis vero fuerit *Mitriades* ille Haeticus, sive *Mitriades*, cujus est mentio in hoc fragmento, divinent alii. Profectò non fuerit *Mitriades* Rhetor ab Eusebio ac Hieronymo laudatus, qui sub Antonino Commodo multa scripsit pro Catholica Ecclesia. Age verò jam proferamus Fragmentum ipsum e vetustissimo Codice Ambrosiano decerptum, atque illud eruditorum omnium examini subiciamus, nullum demendo ex erroribus, quibus Librariorum imperitia scripturam saturavit atque foedavit, quamquam nihil ii obstant, quominus pretium rei intelligamus.”

[Tunc sequitur fragmentum ipsum; postea pergit Muratorius:—]

“Vidistin, quot vulnera frustulo huic antiquitatis infixit Librariorum incuria atque ignorantia? Id ipsum aliis bene multis Libris accidisse noveris: quod ego experientiâ quoque complurium annorum perspectum habeo. Interrogabis autem, cur nihilo secius plerosque Codices ad nos venisse videamus a mendis, et certe a tanta deformitate liberos. Equidem puto, subsequentes Scriptores, prout quisque iudicio atque eruditione pollebat, quum exscribebant aut dictabant veterum libros, identidem extersisse ejusmodi sordes; atque hinc potissimum natam tantam Variarum Lectionum segetem, quae in conferendis antiquorum Libris deprehenditur, quum quisque aut divinando propria auctorum verba restitueret, aut ex ingenio suo suppleret. Sane inter eruditos praeferrî consueverunt recentioribus Codices antiquiores; neque injuriâ. Quo enim propius ad fontem accedunt, eo etiam potiori jure censentur retinere mentem ac verba sincera sui auctoris. Attamen sunt et recentiores Codices interdum, in quibus major quam in vetustis occurrit castigata lectio, sive quod ab optimis exemplaribus descripti fuerint, sive quod vir aliquis doctus errores ab apographo novo arcuerit sive sustulerit, quibus vetusta exemplaria scatebant. Nam quod est ad indoctos, vel suo tempore Sanctus Hieronymus ad Lucinium scribens, inculpabat *imperitiam Notariorum, Librariorumque incuriam, qui scribunt non quod inveniunt, sed quod intelligunt: et dum alienos errores emendare nituntur, ostendunt suos*. Alibi quoque eadem repetit sanctus ille vir. Sed nunquam desiderati sunt eruditi viri, quorum curâ vitiatas Libris identidem succurrebatur.”

## B.

The following are works in which the Muratorian Canon is discussed. Part of the list is from Credner. Those which I have had before me while writing are marked \*; those marked † are some of those in which the Fragment is printed.

\*† L. A. Muratori. *Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi*. tom. iii. p. 854. Mediolani 1740.  
Mosheim. *Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum*. p. 164. Helmstaedt. 1753.

† Stosch. *Commentatio historico-critica de librorum N. Testamenti canone*. p. 179, seq. Francofurti ad Viadrum 1755.

† Gallandii *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*. II. p. xxviii. et 208. Venetiis, 1766.

\*† Simon de Magistris. *Daniel secundum LXX ex Tetraplis Origenis*. pp. 467-9. Romae 1772.

Schröckh. *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*. Pt. 3. ed. 2. p. 426 seq. 1777.

Chr. Fr. Schmidt. *Kritische Untersuchung ob die Offenbarung Johannis ein göttliches Buch sey*. pp. 101-119. Leipsic 1771.

Id. *Historia antiqua et Vindicatio Canonis*. p. 308 seq. Lips. 1775.

(Corrodi). *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des Jüdischen und Christlichen Bibel-Kanons*. Pt. 2. p. 219 seq. Halle 1792.

Lumper. *Historia Theologico-critica*. VII. p. 26. Augustae Vind. 1790.

Keil in Fabricii *Bibliotheca Graeca*; ed. Harles. VII. p. 285 seq. Hamburg. 1801.

Francis Freindaller. *Caii Romani presbyteri uti videtur fragmentum acephalum de Canone divinatorum novi foederis librorum Commentatio*. Salisburgi 1803<sup>a</sup>.

† Zimmermann. *Dissertatio historico-critica scriptoris incerti de Canone librorum sacrorum fragmentum a Muratorio repertum exhibens*. Jenae 1805.

\* Olshausen. *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien*. pp. 281-4. Königsberg 1823.

\*† Eichhorn. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. IV. pp. 33-38. Leipsic 1827.

\* Hug. *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Ed. iv. Pt. 1. pp. 105-108. Stuttgart. 1847. (Also in earlier editions.)

Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*. IV. pp. 2-37. Oxonii 1818.

\*† Id. Ed. 2. I. pp. 393-434. 1846.

<sup>a</sup> This is the title given by Credner in his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanon*, p. 141. In his *Geschichte des Kanons* (1847), he only gave the author's name and the place and date, "Linz. 1802," adding in a note, "Freindallers Schrift ist mir nicht zugänglich gewesen, weshalb ich den Titel nicht angeben kann. Dieselbe ist mir nur bekannt aus den Auszügen, welche sich bei Routh finden." Routh in his second edition says (i. 401), "In prima editione harum Reliquiarum olim dixi, hoc Fragmentum de Canone distulisse me in medium adducere,

propterea quod novissima ejusdem editio nondum ad manus pervenisset meas; tandem vero transmissam ea Germania mihi fuisse opellam a viro quodam nobili peregre agente, quae ante *Linci* prodierat anno 1802." Although Credner quotes Freindaller through Routh, he only mentions the first edition of his *Reliquiae* 1818. Eichhorn in his *Einleitung in das N. T.* vol. 3. pt. 2. (1814.) p. 623, gives the date of Freindaller's book as 1803; but, like Routh, he speaks of its having been published at *Linz*, not, as Credner says, *Salzburg*.

\*† Kirchhofer. Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus. pp. 1, 2. 499. Zurich 1842.

\* Thiersch. Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schriften. pp. 384-7. Erlangen 1845.

\*† Credner, Zur Geschichte des Kanons. pp. 71-94. Halle 1847.

† Karl Wieseler. Der Canon des N. T.'s von Muratori, von neuen verglichen und in Zusammenhange erläutert. Theol. Studien und Kritiken 1847. pp. 818 seq.

\*† Chr. Wordsworth, D. D. On the Canon of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Appendix, pp. 4-6. 1848.

\*† Id. On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, or On the Canon of the Old and New Testament, (second edition of the former work). pp. 342-4. 1851.

\* Tregelles. A Lecture on the Authorship, &c. of the Books of the New Testament. 1852. pp. 15 seq.

\*† Van Gilse. Disputatio de Antiquissimo Librorum Sacrorum Novi Foederis Catalogo, qui vulgo Fragmentum Muratorii appellatur. Amstelodami 1852.

\* Reuss. Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments. § 310. pp. 289-291. ed. 2. Brunswick. 1853.—\* ed. 3. pp. 289-291. 1860.

\*† Guericke. Gesamtgeschichte des Neuen Testaments: oder Neutestamentliche Isagogik. ed. 2. pp. 587-596. Leipsic 1854.

\*† Bunsen. Analecta Ante-Nicaena. I. 125-155. London 1854.

Bötticher in Guericke und Rudelbach's Zeitschrift für lutherischer Theologie. 1854. Heft 1, 2.

\* Tregelles. On a Passage in the Muratorian Canon. (Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, March 1855, pp. 37-43.)

\*† Westcott. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the first four Centuries. pp. 235-245. 557-564. Cambridge 1855.

Credner. Ueber die ältesten Verzeichnisse der heiligen Schriften der Katholischen Kirche. Theol. Jahrb. 1857. III. p. 208 seq.

\*† Credner. Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canon. Herausgegeben von Dr. G. Volkmar. pp. 141-170, (and Volkmar's additions, pp. 341-363). Berlin 1860.

\* Gaussen. Le Canon des Saintes Ecritures au double point de vue, de la science et de la foi. pp. 254-261. Lausanne 1860.

\* Bleek. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. pp. 640 seq. Berlin 1862.

\*† Hilgenfeld. Der Canon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments in ihrer geschichtlichen Ausbildung und Gestaltung, nebst Herstellung und Beleuchtung des Muratorischen Bruchstücks. pp. 39-44. Halle 1863.

\*† Westcott. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament. 2nd ed. pp. 184-193. 466-480. London and Cambridge 1866.

Some of these works have been commonly referred to in connection with the Muratorian Fragment; and others, though comparatively recent in date, are of such real value that they ought to be mentioned. I do not believe that I have myself overlooked anything of great importance published on the subject. As to some of the books referred to, which I have not before me, I am sufficiently acquainted through the information of

others, or from the quotations and analyses in books to which I have access. The disadvantage of being almost entirely dependent on the contents of my own study, is felt in the inability to use constantly many works which may be regarded as standard authorities, and which are not likely to be in the hands of a mere private student; but whether or not there be access to public libraries, it is very difficult to keep up an acquaintance with what has been published on any critical subject; and after this has been made a matter of constant attention, I am well aware that there is great danger of passing by some work which, if it had been known, might have supplied what is important. In the present case I trust that I have overlooked nothing important; I have used, I believe, all reasonable diligence; but with the exception of the work of Muratori, *all* the books which I have marked as being before me are those belonging to my own study, and a great part of them was collected solely for the purpose of elucidating the Muratorian Fragment.

## PART II.

## § 1. THE MURATORIAN CANON line for line.

The lines in SMALL CAPITALS are red in the MS.

Letters erased by a corrector are in *italics*: those which are merely faded are not so marked.

The corrections between the lines are so placed in the MS.: those in brackets are introduced into the line itself.

Fol. ia. [10<sup>a</sup> of MS.]

quibus tamen Interfuit et ita posuit.

TERTIO EUANGELII LIBRUM SEC<sup>u</sup>ANDO LUCAN

Lucas Iste medicus post acensum <sup>s</sup> XPI.

Cum eo Paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum.

5 Secundum adsumsisset numeni suo

ex opinione concriset dñm tamen nec Ipse

dūdidit in carne et idē <sup>ut</sup> pro asequi potuit.

Ita et ad natiuitate Iohannis incipet dicere.

QUARTI EUANGELIORUM IOHANNIS EX DECIPOLIS

10 cohortantibus condiscipulis et ēps suis

dixit conieiunate mihi. odie triduo et quid

cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum

nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue

latum andreae ex apostolis ut recognis



gerebantur sicut et semote passionē Petri  
 euidenter declarat Sed <sup>&</sup> profectionē pauli ad[b] ur  
 bes ad spaniā proficescentis Epistolæ autem  
 Pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directe  
 10 sint uolentatibus intellegere Ipse declarantꝫ  
 Primū omnium corintheis scysmæ heresis In  
 terdicens deInceps B <sup>c</sup> callatis circumcissione  
 Romanis autē ornidine scripturarum sed et  
 principium earum *osd* esse xpm Intimans  
 15 prolexius scripsit de quibus sincolis Necesse  
 est ad nobis desputari Cum ipse beatus  
 apostolus paulus sequens prodecessoris sui  
 Iohannis ordinē nonnisi <sup>n</sup> comenatī . semptae  
<sup>ii</sup> eccleses scribat ordine tali a corenthios  
 20 prima . ad efesios seconda ad philippinses ter  
 tia ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quin  
 ta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta. ad romanos  
 septima Uerum core<sup>h</sup>[i]ntheis et tesaolecen  
 sibus licet pro correptione Iteretur una  
 25 tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia  
 deffusa esse denoscitur Et Iohannis enī In a  
 pocalebsy licet septē eccleseis scribat  
 tamen omnibus dicit uerū ad filemonem una'  
 et at titū una et ad tymotheū duas pro affec  
 30 to et dilectione In honore tamen ecclesiae ca  
 tholice In ordinatione ecclesiastice

Fol. ii<sup>a</sup>. [11<sup>a</sup> of MS.]

de[i]scepline <sup>re</sup>scificate sunt Fertur etiam ad  
 Laudecenses alia ad alexandrinos Pauli no  
 mine fincte ad hesem marcionis et alia plu  
 ra quae In *ch*atholicam ecclesiam recepi non  
 5 potest Fel enim cum melle misceri non con  
 cruit epistola sane Iude et superscriptio  
 Iohannis duas In catholica habentur Et sapi  
 entia ab amicis salomonis in honorē ipsius  
 scripta apocalapse etiam Iohanis et Pe  
 10 tri tantum recipe[i]mus quam quidam ex nos  
 tris legi In ecclesia nolunt Pastorem uero  
 nuperrim *et* temporibus nostris In urbe  
 roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe  
 tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio <sup>r</sup>eps frater  
 15 eius et ideo legi eum quidē Oportet se pu  
 plicare uero In ecclesia populo Neque inter  
 profe\*<sup>s</sup>tas completum numero Neque Inter  
 apostolos In finē temporum potest.  
 Arsinoi autem seu ualentini. uel mitiade<sup>i</sup>s  
 20 nihil In totum recipemus. Qui etiam nouū  
 psalmorum librum marcioni conscripse  
 runt una cum basilide assianum catafry  
 cum <sup>s</sup>contitutorem

§ 2. The passage from St. Ambrose as it stands in the MS. *twice* after the Muratorian Canon : with the variations (except those of spelling) of the text of the Benedictine edition 287, 288 (Paris 1686) subjoined to the *first* transcript.

Fol. 11<sup>a</sup>. l. 24.

24 ABRHAM NOMERAVIT SERUOLUS SUOS UER  
 naculus et cum trecentis dece et octo  
 uiru[i]s adeptus uictoriam liuerauit nepotē  
 prouatur diuisionis adfectus quando sic  
 amabat nepotem ut pro eo nec uelli decli  
 nare periculum<sup>t</sup> Quid est nomerauit hoc  
 30 est elegit Unde et illud non solū ad scien  
 tiam dei refertur. Sed etiā ad cratia Iustorum

*Collation of Fol. 11<sup>a</sup>, with Ambrose.*

l. 24. <i>ab init.</i> "quo comperto" <i>ed.</i>	Abrham <i>sic</i> in MS.	Abraam <i>ed.</i>
l. 26. liberavit <i>ed.</i>	27. probatur <i>ed.</i>	28. uelli] belli <i>ed.</i> ("vellit, sic prima manu, rasurâ effectum velli." Ceriani.)
	30. <i>om.</i> et <i>ed.</i>	31. gratiam.

Fol. 11<sup>b</sup>.de ab

quod in euangelio dicit  $\overline{\text{dñs}} \overline{\text{ih̄s}}$  et capilli uestri  
 omnes numerati sunt cognouit ergo  $\overline{\text{dñs}}$  qui  
 sunt eius. *Eos autem* eos autē qui non sunt  
 ipsius non dignatur cognoscere Numerauit  
 5 cccxviii ut scias non quantitātē numeri sed me  
 ritum electionis expressu. Eos enim adscuit  
 quod<sup>s</sup> dignu[o]s numero iudicauit fidelium<sup>i</sup> \* \* \* \* \*  
 qui in  $\overline{\text{dñi}}$  nostri  $\overline{\text{ih̄u}}$   $\overline{\text{xpi}}$  passionem crederent  
 ccc enim  $\text{d} \tau$  greca littera significat. dece  
 10 et octo autē summa IH exprimit nomen fidei  
 Ergo merito habraham uicit non populo  
 exercito deneque eos quibus quinque regum  
 arma ceserunt cum paucis egressus uer  
 naculis triumphauit Sed qui uincit non  
 15 debet arorocare sibi uictoria sed referre  
 deo. hoc abraaham docit qui triumpho  
 homilior factus est non superuior. sacri  
 ficium denique obtulit decimas dedit  
 ideoque eum melchisedeh qui interpe  
 20 tratione latine dicitur rex Iustitiae rex  
 pacis benedixit erat enim sacerdos sum  
 mi  $\overline{\text{d̄i}}$  qui est rex Iustitiae sacerdos dei  
 non<sup>isi</sup> cui dicitur tu es sacerdos in aeternū  
 secondū ordine melchisedeh hoc est dei  
 25 filius sacerdos patris qui sui corporis  
 sacrificio patrem nostris repropicia<sup>n</sup>  
 uit dilectis + nomerauit abraam seruo  
 los suos uernaculos et cum cccxviii uiris  
 adeptus uictoria liuerauit nepotem quid  
 30 est nomerauit. hoc est elegit. unde et illud  
 non solum ad scientiā dei refertu\*r sed  
 etiam ad cratia Iustorum

Fol. 12<sup>a</sup>.braa

- quod in evangelio dicit dñs ihs et capilli uestri  
 omnes nomerati sunt. cognouit ergo dñs qui  
 sunt ipsius. eos autem qui non sunt ipsius non  
 dignatur cognoscere. Nomeravit autē cccxviii  
 5 ut scias non quantitātē numeri sed meritum  
 electionis expressum. Eos autem sciuit quod  
 dignos numero iudicavit fideleium qui in dñi  
 nostri ihu xpi passionem crederent. ccc enim  
 dece et octo greca littera significat xviii  
 10 autem summa IH exprimit nomen fidei.  
 ergo abraham uicit non populosu exercitu  
 denique eos quibus V regum arma cesserunt  
 cum paucis egressus uernaculis trium  
 phauit. Sed qui uincit non debet arrogare  
 15 sibi uictoriā sed dō referri hoc abraham  
 docit qui triumpho humilior factus est.  
 Non soperior sacrificium N denique obtu  
 lit decimas dedit ideoque eum melcisedeh  
 qui interpetraone latina rex iustitiae  
 20 rex pacis benedixit. erat enim sacerdos  
 summi dī qui est rex iustitiae sacerdos dī  
 nisi cui dicitur tu es sacerdos in aeternum  
 secundum ordine melcisedeh hoc est filii  
 us sacerdos patris qui suis corporis sacri  
 25 ficat patrē nostris repropitiāuit dilectis.

*Collation of Fol. 11<sup>b</sup>. with Ambrose.*

1. i. dixit *ed.*      2. (nomerati *sic* Ceriani, and Westcott's own transcript.)      ergo]  
 autem *ed.*      3. ejus] ipsius *ed.*      4. numeravit] add. autem *ed.*      10. sum-  
 mam *ed.*      om. nomen *ed.*      15. sibi arrogare *ed.*      victoriam *ed.*      deferre *ed.*  
 16. docet *ed.*      17. factus humilior *ed.*      18. "prius videtur scriptum fuisse deo  
 pro dedit; sed prior vel altera manus ex o effecit dit (dedit)." Ceriani.      19. eum]  
 ei *ed.*      20. latina *ed.*      23. quis *ed.*      24. ordinem *ed.*      27. delictis *ed.*  
 "Hic + inscribitur manu alia, et in margine manu ut puto recentiori *hic dimite*; et  
 reapse repetitur jam descriptum." Ceriani.

From this place, where the second transcript begins, the passage is collated with the first copy.

*Collation of the second transcript of the passage from Ambrose with the first.*

Fol. 11<sup>b</sup>.—1. 27. nomerauit abr.] abr. nomerauit. 28. seruolos suos uernaculos] seruolus suos uernaculus. 29. uictoria] uictoriam. nepotem] add. prouatur diuisionis—declinare periculum 11<sup>a</sup>. ll. 27—29. 31. scientiam (without *dei*)] scientiam dei. So Westcott. But Ceriani has *dei* in his transcript as given above.

Fol. 12<sup>a</sup>.—1. 3. ipsius] eius. 4. cognoscere] cognoscere. Westcott. But Ceriani's transcript as given above has *cognoscere* in the first as well as the second occurrence. 4. nomeravit autē] numeravit (*om. autem*). cccxviii.] cccviii. Westcott: but Ceriani gives cccxviii. in both places. 6. eos autem] eos enim. sciu] adsciu. 7. numero] numero. fideleium] fidelium. ("τὸ ε secundum [in voce *fideleium*] in parte recentius effectum videtur." Ceriani.) 9. dece et octo] δ τ. (Thus it seems as if in the first copy the transcriber had begun to write *decem et octo*, a meaningless blunder, which he adopted in the second instance.) 11. ergo] ergo merito. abraham] habraham. populosu exercitu] populo exercito. 12. denique] deneque. 14. triumphauit] triumfauit. debit] debet. 15. uictoriā] uictoria. dō referri] referre deo. 17. soperior] superuor. sacrificium] sacrificium. N "*sic cum aliquali rasurae indicio*." Ceriani. The scribe seems to have begun "*non*" again from the commencement of the line. 18. melcisedeh] melchisedeh. 19. interpretaone latina rex] interpretatione latine dicitur rex. 23. filii[us] dei filius. 24. sacerdos] -dos. sacrificat] sacrificio. 25. repropitiauit] repropiciauit.

It is worthy of notice, that in the MS. the opposite pages 11<sup>b</sup>. and 12<sup>a</sup>. commence with the same line, so that the repeated fragment and the former transcript are on the parts of the pages directly in front of each other: and yet the transcriber neither appears to have been conscious that he was repeating his work, nor yet that the former transcript might have been a check on the repetition.

§ 3. Mr. Westcott's remarks on the manner in which the Fragment and the Extract from Ambrose are written <sup>a</sup>:—

"Thus in thirty lines there are thirty-three unquestionable clerical blunders, including one important omission (p. 11<sup>b</sup>. 29), two other omissions

<sup>a</sup> A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, by Brooke Foss Westcott, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second edition, 1866, Appendix, pp. 474-7. In using so amply the remarks of Mr. Westcott, I wish in the most explicit manner to acknowledge my obligation for the

kind permission given by him to use whatever suited my purpose in his Appendix. His analysis and classification of the systematic mistakes of the scribe are very searching and valuable; and his estimate is scarcely at all affected by the variations between his transcript and Ceriani's of the passage from St. Ambrose.

which destroy the sense completely (p. 12<sup>a</sup> 11 *merito*, 19 *dicitur*), one substitution equally destructive of the sense (p. 12<sup>a</sup> 9 *decem et octo* for τ), and four changes which appear to be intentional and false alterations (p. 12<sup>a</sup> 6 *scirit*, 11 *populosu exercitu*, 23 *fili* [and om. *dei*], 25 *sacrificat*). We have therefore to deal with the work of a scribe either unable or unwilling to understand the work which he was copying, and yet given to arbitrary alteration of the text before him from regard simply to the supposed form of words. To these graver errors must be added the misuse of the letters (e. g. of *u* for *o*, and conversely of *o* for *u*; of *g* for *c*; of *f* for *ph*; of *i* for *e*, and conversely of *e* for *i*; of *ei* for *i*; of *u* for *b*; of *c* for *ch*), and the omission of the final *m*.

“Nor yet was the actual writer of the Manuscript the only author of errors. It appears from the repetition of one or two obvious mistakes in the repeated fragment that the text from which the copy was made was either carelessly written or much injured. Thus we have in both transcripts *ad cratia*, *docit*, *homilior*, *dilectis* (for *delictis*); and it is scarcely likely that *interpetratione* and *interpetraone* could have been copied severally from a legible original.

“On the other hand, the text itself as it stands is substantially a good one. The errors by which it is deformed are due to carelessness and ignorance, and not to the badness of the source from which it was taken. But these errors are such as in several cases could not be rectified without other authorities for comparison.

“In the sheet which precedes the Fragment on the Canon the same phenomena occur. There is in that also the same ignorance of construction: the same false criticism: the same confusion of letters and terminations. If we now apply the results gained from the examination of the context to the Fragment on the Canon, part of it at least can be restored with complete certainty; and part may be pronounced hopelessly corrupt. It has been shewn that a fragment of thirty lines contains three serious omissions, and at least two other changes of words wholly destructive of the sense; and it would therefore be almost incredible that something of the like kind should not occur in a passage nearly three times as long. Other evidence shews that conjecture would have been unable to supply what is wanting or satisfactorily correct what is wrong in the one case, and there is no reason to hope that it would be happier in the other.

“1. Two of the commonest blunders in the Manuscript are the interchange of *u* and *o*, and the omission of the final *m*. Of these undoubted examples occur: p. 11<sup>a</sup> 25, 11<sup>b</sup> 9 *dece*, 11<sup>b</sup> 24 *secondum ordine*, p. 9<sup>a</sup> 22 *in mala partem* &c., 11<sup>b</sup> 11 *populoso exercito*, p. 12<sup>a</sup> 11 *populosu exercitu*,

p. 12<sup>a</sup> 24 sacerdos, &c. In the Fragment similar errors occur: p. 10<sup>a</sup> 2 tertio (-um), secundo (-um); 4 eo (eum); 11 triduo (-um); [23 adventu (-to)]; 24 primo (-um); [foit (fuit)]; 26 foturum; 29 semetipsu (-o); p. 10<sup>b</sup> 1 visurem (-orem); 12 circumcissione (-em); 17 apostulus<sup>b</sup>; 20 secunda; 29 affecto; 11<sup>a</sup> 6 epistola (elsewhere epistula).

"2. The interchange of *e* and *i* (*y*) is even more common. Examples occur: p. 11<sup>b</sup> 16 docit; 27 dilectis (delictis); 12<sup>a</sup> 14 debit; 15 referri (referre); 11<sup>b</sup> 12 deneque; 9<sup>a</sup> 11 proxemi. In the Fragment the same error is found in various combinations: p. 10<sup>a</sup> 5 numeni (nomine); 8 incipet; 9 iohannis (so l. 15, 10<sup>b</sup> 26); 14 recogniscentibus; 16 discriberet, licit; 24 dispectus; p. 10<sup>b</sup> 3 profetetur; 5 conprindit; 6 sicute; 8 proficescentis; 11 corintheis; 15 prolexius; 16 desputari; 18 nomenatim; 19 corenthios; 20 philippinses; 21 colosensis; 23 corentheis; 26 deffusa, denoscitur; 27 apocalebsy, eccleseis; p. 11<sup>a</sup> 3 heresem; 4 recepi (10, 20 recipimus).

"3. The aspirate is also omitted or inserted: p. 8<sup>b</sup> 26 talamo; 11<sup>b</sup> 11 Habraham; 12<sup>a</sup> 18 Melcisedeh. Thus we have in the Fragment p. 10<sup>a</sup> 11 odie; p. 10<sup>b</sup> 11 scysma.

"4. *b* and *g* are interchanged: p. 11<sup>b</sup> 15 arrocare; 31 cratia; 12<sup>a</sup> 17 sacrificium. So in the Fragment 10<sup>a</sup> 17 sinculis; 28 sincula; 10<sup>b</sup> 15 sincolis (5 singula); 12 callætis<sup>c</sup>; 21 calatas; 11<sup>a</sup> 6 concruit; 23 catafrycum.

"5. *E* and *ae* are interchanged: p. 9<sup>a</sup> 13 consumate iustitiae; p. 9<sup>a</sup> 9 audi et vidæ. In the Fragment 10<sup>a</sup> 25 preclarum; 10<sup>b</sup> 9 directe; 10 ipse; 18 semptæ; 30 ecclesiae catholice; 31 eclesiastice descepline; p. 11<sup>a</sup> 1 scificate; 3 fincte, heresem; 6 iude; 14 aeclesiae.

"6. *F* and *ph*: 11<sup>b</sup> 14 triumfauit (16 triumpho). So in the Fragment p. 10<sup>b</sup> 4 Theofile; 28 Filemonem.

"7. Another common interchange is that of *b* and *p*, which occurs in the Fragment: p. 10<sup>b</sup> 4 scribta obtime; 24 correbtione; 27 apocalebsy; and conversely, 11<sup>a</sup> 16 puplicare.

"In addition to these changes of letters, the repetition of letters and the omission of repeated letters are fruitful sources of error. Of the former there are examples: p. 11<sup>b</sup> 15 arorocare; eos autem. In the Fragment both, I believe, occur. In p. 11<sup>a</sup> 6 superscriptio iohannis is an evident mistake for superscripti iohannis, the *o* having been falsely added to the *ti* from a confusion with the corresponding syllable of the next word.

<sup>b</sup> It will be seen from Mr. Westcott's remarks that he reads *apostulus* in this line; this may be supported by the form of *u* in *sui* in the same line; but still the letter appears to be

intended for *o*. Compare *apostolos* in 11<sup>a</sup> l. 18.

<sup>c</sup> This word was at first *callatis*; it seems to me to have been altered into *callactis*, not "*callactis*."

Again, in p. 10<sup>a</sup> 22, the pronoun *suis* requires an antecedent, and it is extremely likely that *dui* was omitted between the words *de nativitate*. So again in p. 10<sup>b</sup> 3 *profitetur* requires *se*, which was probably lost after *visorem* before *sed*. It is not unlikely that in p. 11<sup>a</sup> 2 *alia* should be repeated.

“One false reading appears to be due to the mechanical assimilation of terminations, of which examples occur: p. 12<sup>a</sup> 19 *interpetraone latina* (-ne); 11 *populosu exercitu*; p. 11<sup>b</sup> 11 *popoloso exercito*. Thus p. 10<sup>b</sup> 4 *optime Theophile* should almost certainly be *optime Theophilo*. The phrase ‘*optime Theophile*’ is found in the Preface to the Gospels, and not in the dedication to the Acts, and could not therefore be used as the title of the latter book.

“Some forms are mere senseless and unintelligible blunders: 10<sup>a</sup> 6 *concribset*; 10<sup>b</sup> 22, 23 *Tensaolenecinsis*, *Thesaolecensibus*; 11<sup>a</sup> 9 *apocalypse*. And the inconsistency of the scribe is seen in the variations of spelling the same word: 10<sup>b</sup> 11 *Corintheis*, 19 *Corenthios*, 20 *Corentheis*; and so with *Iohannes* and *discipulus*. But *prodecessoris* (10<sup>b</sup> 17) and *finctae* (11<sup>a</sup> 3) are probably genuine forms.

“If, then, we take account of these errors, we shall obtain a text of the Fragment as complete as the conditions of correction will allow. Two or three passages in it will remain which can only be dealt with by conjectures wholly arbitrary and uncertain.”

To Mr. Westcott's thorough investigation of the text of the Fragment, aided by the comparison with the errors of the scribe in the twofold copy of the extract from St. Ambrose, I should be inclined to add that considerable allowance should also be made for the mistakes of the translator from the Greek: for to his want of apprehension of the Greek Text before him, I believe that some of the obscurities are due; and bearing in mind a Greek original, we may *test* some of the conjectural restorations, and thus we may be aided in the criticism of the Fragment.

After the analysis of Westcott, we may form some estimate of the opinion of Volkmar: “The MS. is so little a corrupt one, that it far rather belongs to the most correct.” If so, I should be inclined in all seriousness to ask Volkmar *what* he would consider a corrupt MS. to be, and whether he ever saw or heard of one that was really such? For even if it were true that the language of the eighth and ninth centuries were such as is here found (the age, be it remembered, of Bede and Alcuin), it would shew at least a grievous corruption from that of the second century, to which the *authorship* belongs, whatever be the date of the translation from the Greek.

I should be truly sorry if this judgment of Volkmar's should mislead any one; for this "perverse ingenuity" (as it has been well termed by Westcott) might cause it to be supposed that MSS. in general are so blundering and illiterate, that they shadow forth but faintly in *any* case the meaning of an author. It is quite true that transcription was of old often purely mechanical<sup>d</sup>; but when a scribe knew what he was copying, it was often very different.

Wide circulation has been given of late to an opinion of Prof. Cobet, who says, "*Nullum unquam vidi codicem, qui sine multiplici emendatione legi intelligique posset. vel antiquissimus et optimus quisque saepe turpissimis erroribus, quorum nunc tironem paulo diligentiores puderet, inquinatus est*."<sup>e</sup> To this strong statement I might reply; 'I have seen and collated several MSS., Latin, Greek, and Syriac<sup>f</sup>, in which the errors and blunders were but few; and for which *multiplex emendatio* would be as much out of place, as it would for an ordinary letter now received by the post; and such MSS. are not only *optimi*, but also usually *antiquissimi*.'

The fact is, that ancient scribes may be compared to modern compositors—some very ignorant and careless, and some very trustworthy and exact. A proof sheet from the hands of one of the latter class is often reasonably correct; while *multiplex emendatio* on the part of the press corrector is a painful necessity for one of the former kind; and then, too, there is the danger of the revision being so misunderstood as to introduce new errors.

<sup>d</sup> In the undivided writing in capitals, unless the eye of the copyist *caught* the divisions, he had to transcribe as well as he could letter by letter. δὸς δὴ μοι τὸ βιβλίδιον, ἵνα μεταγράψωμαι αὐτό. Λάβε, φησὶν, αὐτό, καὶ ἀποδώσεις μοι. ἔλαβον ἐγὼ καὶ εἷς τινα τόπον τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἀναχωρήσας μετεγράψαμην πάντα πρὸς γράμμα. οὐκ ἠῤῥισκον γὰρ τὰς συλλαβάς. Hermas, Vis. II. 1. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Cited in the Quarterly Review, No. 240, Oct. 1866, p. 339.

<sup>f</sup> The general accuracy of Hebrew MSS. has been often remarked. The copyists must have been peculiarly careful and conscientious as a class. Some Jews carry out the same exactitude as printers of Hebrew.

## PART III.

§ 1. HOWEVER great may be the errors of translator or copyists, and however obscure in consequence some parts of the Muratorian Fragment may be, the general testimony which it bears to the Canon of the New Testament is certain and clear.

The author acknowledges four Gospels, the third and fourth of which are specified to be those of Luke and John. The first Epistle of John; the Acts as written by Luke. Epistles of Paul to seven Churches, enumerated by name, to two of which he wrote twice; and, in connection with these seven, the Apocalypse of John is incidentally mentioned. The four pastoral Epistles of the Apostle Paul; the Epistle of Jude, and two (*other* apparently) Epistles of John previously named. Thus all the books which we receive as belonging to the Canon of the New Testament are distinctly recognized, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, and the two of Peter. Besides these, certain books are mentioned as not received by the Catholic Church. An Apocalypse of Peter is introduced with that of John, though not approved by some as a book to be read in the Church. Also the Shepherd of Hermas, as a recent writing, and therefore not belonging either to prophets or apostles. Besides these books of the New Testament and others, the Wisdom of Solomon is introduced in a manner which has been differently explained by various scholars, and which some have thought to be a proof of an omission in the MS., which has been judged (rightly I believe) to have various hiatus.

§ 2. In the remarks on the Canon line for line, I give the criticisms of others together with my own: as to these I use Routh's words, "*Quae malis elige mea vel ista*" (i. 407).

10<sup>a</sup> 1. *quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit.*

It is clear from what follows that these words relate to the second Gospel mentioned by the writer; and no one appears to have doubted that the writer is speaking of the Gospel of Mark.

Some who have discussed this ancient Canon have sought to restore from conjecture what it seems to them might have been a suitable beginning. Thus Volkmar, who, like Credner, considers that this was a short independent treatise, and not a fragment from a work, prefixes the title "*Ordo librorum quos ecclesia catholica recipit*," and then, after enumerating the books of the Old Testament, he speaks of the Gospels, and thus connects

the words in the Fragment with his supposed restoration:—" [Marcus non ipse vidit Dominum in carne, sed audivit Petrum; ali]quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit." (In Credner's *Geschichte der N. T. Kanon*, p. 355.) Credner himself suggests as the probable title, "Tractatus de libris quos ecclesia catholica apostolicos recipit." (N. T. Canon, p. 153.) But all such supposed titles are only consistent with the opinion that the Fragment is not a portion of a larger work.

Bunsen (*Anal. Ante-Nicaena*, i. 142), in his attempted restoration in both Latin and Greek, thus emends the words as applied to Mark the Evangelist: "quibus tamen *ipse non* interfuit et ita posuit." οἷς δὲ αὐτὸς οὐ παρῆν, οὕτως καὶ ἔθηκεν. In this, however, the writer probably uses the same expression as is found in Eusebius (*Dem. Evan.* III. 3. p. 121<sup>a</sup>), οὐ γὰρ παρῆν ὁ Μάρκος τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λεχθεῖσιν. Hilgenfeld is content to let his retranslation into Greek express no more than now stands in the Fragment "... οἷς δὲ παρῆν, καὶ οὕτως τέθεται." Van Gilse says, "Ea autem quibus interfuit probabiliter non sunt res a Christo gestae, sed Petri de rebus a Christo gestis narrationes, quibus Marcus . . . interfuit . . . E verbis, quibus auctor mox de Luca utitur, *Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne*, clare apparet, eum simile quid de Marco tradidisse et fere sic scripsisse 'Marcus Dominum nec vidit nec audivit, sed e Petri sermonibus quibus tamen interfuit, narrationem de Christo contextuit.'" Routh thus speaks of the mutilated beginning: "Hujusmodi quid scripsisse Auctor fragmenti videri possit: *Marcus discipulus et interpret Petri juxta quod Petrum referentem audierit* (huc usque Hieronymi verba affero, *De Viris Ill.* c. 8.) digessit res gestas a Domino, quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit. Sed incertum sit necesse est hujus mutilatae sententiae supplementum." Westcott's note is, "*Et ita*, i. e. καὶ οὕτως, even so (as he had heard from St. Peter), without addition or omission. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39."

§ 3. 10<sup>a</sup> l. 2. *Tertio Evangelii librum secundo Lucam.*

"Tertio" is corrected into *tertium* by Van Gilse, Bunsen, and Westcott; this, of course, may be probable, from the *system* of the inaccuracies of the MS.; but it is not certain; and others allow the reading of the MS. to stand. The word itself may well have proceeded from the translator into Latin.

"Secundo," from the analogy of the errors as well as the sense, is of course *secundum*<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> "Reposuit et Freindaller *secundum*, qui seu tituli evangeliorum ex hoc Fragmento os- recte monuit, antiquitatem hujus epigraphes tendi." Routh.

- P. 10<sup>a</sup> l. 3. *Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi  
cum eo Paulus quasi ut iuris studiosum*  
5. *secundum adsumsisset numeni suo*  
*ex opinione concribset dominum tamen nec ipse*  
*vidit in carne et idem prout asequi potuit.*  
8. *Ita et ad nativitate Johannis incipet dicere.*

l. 4. "Cum eo," rightly corrected into *cum eum* by the critics. "Eo" may have arisen from the copyist taking *cum* for the prep. governing the ablative (and thus misunderstanding the sentence), which seems *here* more probable than the systematic confusion of terminations.

"Juris studiosum." Routh corrects "quasi *et* juris (καὶ τοῦ δικαίου) stud." Westcott says, "The words *ut juris* must be corrupt. *Juris* might stand for τοῦ δικαίου, but not for τῆς δικαιοσύνης. *Virtutis* seems to be nearer the sense." Van Gilse, "quasi ut sui studiosum." Bunsen conjectures "itineris socium, συνοδοιπόρον." My own judgment is given below.

l. 5. "Secundum adsumsisset," Routh corrects, *secum* adsumpsisset, referring to Acts xv. 37; which is followed by Credner (1847) and Van Gilse. Westcott says, "The correction of Routh, *secum* for *secundum* (cf. Acts xv. 37), is very plausible. If *secundum* is correct, it must mean *as assistant, as in the second rank*." Credner (1860) says, "*secundum*, as a second, namely besides Silas, Acts xv. 40; xvi. 1." Volkmar asks whether *secundus* is not rather used here altogether like *sequens* in 10<sup>b</sup> l. 17, as "follower," in the special sense of companion or helper. Bunsen retains *secundum* as the representative of δεύτερον: so too Hilgenfeld, supposing it to be the translation of ἀκολοθοῦντα. But may not this *secundum* be simply the result of the Latin translator having divided a preposition used in composition<sup>b</sup> so as to translate it as a separate word? Thus the sentence might have been ἐπεὶ αὐτὸν ὁ Παῦλος ὥσει τοῦ δικαίου (*s. τοῦ νόμου*) ζηλωτὴν κατέλαβεν; and this accounts for the peculiar introduction of "ut juris studiosum," if, as I suppose, it has to do with what Paul recognized in Luke. It seems to me far more natural than the explanations given above to regard *juris studiosum* as the rendering of τοῦ νόμου ζηλωτὴν: compare Acts xxi. 20. Credner's remark and reference would only be consistent with such a theory as would identify Luke with Timothy.

<sup>b</sup> This may be illustrated by the mode in which in the Codex Boernerianus (G of Saint Paul's Epistles), in Phil. iii. 12, κατελήμφθην is given in the Latin version with an alternative

rendering *con* or *ad prehensus sum*: so too in 1 Thes. v. 4, καταλάβου (the reading of the MS.) *ad* or *comprehendat*.

“Numeni” is, of course, *nomine*; not only from the analogy of the copyist’s errors, but from the authority of line 15.

l. 6. “ex opinione,” i. e. *κατὰ δόξαν*, with reference to Luke i. 3, *ἔδοξε καὶ μοί*.” Westcott. Similarly Credner (1860), and Hilgenfeld: Volkmar too adheres to the reading of the MS. Routh, “*Ex ordine* (*καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι* ipse Luc. i. 3.) *ex ordine tibi scribere* Vulgat. Interp. vid. et infra . . . *per ordinem*,” [10<sup>b</sup> 2, 3]. So Credner (1847), Van Gilse, and Bunsen.

“Concribset” is of course *conscripsit*. The following words, “*Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne*,” appear to form a separate member of the sentence; this statement of the second century is important, as contradicting by anticipation the assertions of those later writers who say that Luke was an immediate disciple of our Lord; (one of the *seventy-two* according to Epiphanius, c. Haer. xx. § 4; i. p. 50. *Pet.* i. p. 337. *Dind.*)

l. 7. read *assequi*<sup>c</sup>; and l. 8. *a nativitate* and *incepit*. This reference to the birth of John the Baptist being contained in St. Luke is a valuable testimony to the introductory portion of that Gospel. After line 8, Westcott supposes that some clause is not given in the extract contained in the Fragment.

§ 4. 10<sup>a</sup> l. 9. *Quarti evangeliorum Johannis ex decipolis.*

“Quarti”—“sc. auctor” Credner (1860). “There is no analogy in the Fragment for the change to *quartum*. Probably some sentence or clause has been omitted from which *auctor* could be supplied.” Westcott.

Routh suggests “*quarto*, Evangelium;” Freindaller for “*evangeliorum*” *evangelii librum*, as in line 2.

If *auctor* be understood to belong to the sentence, then the correction of *Johannis* into the nominative adopted by Van Gilse, Westcott, Credner (1860), Volkmar (in full accordance with the system of errors, see line 15), may well stand; but if the word in a lost clause was in the genitive, it would be needless to make any change; and so too if in any manner “*Johannis*” had to do with authorship. The word is not altered into *Johannes* by Routh, Credner (1847), or Bunsen; Hilgenfeld supposes an omission of *secundum Johannem*, and then he connects *Johannes* with what follows.

In the absence of the Greek, and with the appearance that we have to do with fragmentary extracts, we must, I believe, be content with a

<sup>c</sup> Bunsen and Hilgenfeld both suppose this to represent *παρακολουθεῖν*, Luke i. 3. The letter *d*, erased at the commencement of line 7, seems to indicate that the copyist was beginning to

write *dñm* from the line above: this word probably began a line in the copy that he had before him.

general apprehension of the sense. That these are a kind of extracts is shewn, I think, from the varied expressions with which the third and fourth Gospels are respectively introduced. The meaning here seems to be, that the author or extractor had the following account to give "of the fourth of the Gospels, that of John." *Quartum* is adopted at the beginning of this line by Van Gilse (who understands *conscriptis* at the end of the line from what has preceded), Credner (1847), Bunsen, and Hilgenfeld.

Of course "decipolis" is *discipulis*. Credner (*Geschichte des N. T. Canon*, p. 159) sees a distinction in the Fragment between John a *disciple*, the author of the Gospel and first Epistle, and John an *apostle*, who wrote the Apocalypse and the two short Epistles. He insists on Andrew, and not John, being called an apostle. But this is a distinction which could hardly be imagined as in the mind of the writer. There are two reasons why in this place *disciple* should be the designation of John: first (and specially), because another John had been mentioned just before who was not a disciple of our Lord; thus "Johannes ex discipulis" was a simple mode of distinguishing him from the Baptist; secondly, disciple is the habitual term used by John himself in speaking of himself and the other Apostles. Indeed, the word ἀπόστολος occurs only once in his Gospel (xiii. 16), and then hardly in an official sense. See the word μαθητῆς especially used of John (xxi. 24).

- 10<sup>a</sup> l. 10. *cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis*  
*dixit conieciunate mihi odie triduo et quid*  
*cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum*  
*nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue-*  
*latum Andreæ ex apostolis ut recognis*  
 15. *centibus cunctis Johannis suo nomine*  
*cuncta describeret*

l. 10. *condiscipulis*. 11. *hodie*. 13. *enarremus*. 15. *cunctis Johannes*.  
 16. *describeret*.

l. 10. "Is" has been conjectured to be lost before "cohortantibus," which might be easily the case; for from the identity with the last letters of the preceding "discipulis," the monosyllable might be absorbed: so Routh, followed by Bunsen.

l. 12. "Alterutrum" is changed by Van Gilse (following Wieseler) into *alterutri*. Others retain the reading of the MS. Westcott says, "Let us relate to one another the revelation which we receive, to whichever of the two parties the revelation may be given" (p. 478): also he gives as a comment, "whether it be favourable to my writing or not." (p. 187.)

The narration contained in these lines as to the origin of St. John's Gospel is to a certain extent in accordance with the statements of Clement of Alexandria (as quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 14), and by Jerome, who had, I believe (for reasons which will be afterwards stated), this very passage of the writer of the Fragment before him.

The mention of Andrew the Apostle in connection with St. John's Gospel is, I believe, found nowhere else; but this is authority for us to know that those who lived within fifty years of the death of St. John, believed that the Apostle Andrew was a living witness of the acts and teaching of our Lord at the time when the Evangelist wrote our fourth canonical Gospel, which would thus be probably far earlier than the end of the first century. Andrew is here described as "ex apostolis," to distinguish him apparently from the "condiscipulis et episcopis" from whom the request had come to John that he would write. It is worthy of note, that Andrew is more mentioned in this Gospel than in either of the others; his early adherence to Jesus may particularly be observed. In John xxi. 24 there is a kind of *united* attestation to the truths recorded in this Gospel: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ is a sentence which does not read like the words of the actual writer; for it seems to be something said about him by certain others, who are themselves able to attest the facts: now we know that even up to the close of the first century there were living at Ephesus two at least of our Lord's immediate disciples, Aristion and John the Presbyter. All such living when the Gospel was written might well unite in this οἶδαμεν; and if the testimony of the writer of this Fragment be received (to which, in fact, there is no valid objection), then we have included in this word the attestation of the Apostle Andrew likewise.

The account of the authorship of this Gospel, as given out of Clement of Alexandria by Eusebius, stands thus: Τὸν μὲν τοι Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. τοσαῦτα ὁ Κλήμης. (Eus. H. E. vi. 14.) Jerome's account still more resembles what we have in this passage of the Fragment: "Ultimus Joannes Apostolus et Evangelista, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, qui supra pectus Domini recumbens, purissima doctrinarum fluentia potavit, et qui solus de cruce meruit audire, Ecce mater tua. Is quum esset in Asia, et jam tum haereticorum semina pullularent, Cerinthi, Ebionis, et caeterorum qui negant Christum in carne venisse (quos et ipse in Epistola sua Antichristos vocat, et Apostolus Paulus frequenter percutit) coactus est ab omnibus pene tunc Asiae episcopis et multarum ecclesiarum legationibus, de divinitate salvatoris altius

scribere, et ad ipsum (ut ita dicam) Dei Verbum, non tam audaci quam felici temeritate prorumpere. Et Ecclesiastica narrat historia, *quum a fratribus cogeretur* ut scriberet, ita facturum se respondisse, si *indicto jejunio in commune omnes Deum precarentur*, quo expleto revelatione saturatus in illud prooemium caelo veniens eructavit, In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum: hoc erat in principio apud Deum." (Hier. Praef. in Com. super Matthaeum, ed. Vallarsi, vii. 4, 5.) Somewhat similarly he says of the same Evangelist, "*novissimus omnium scripsit evangelium, rogatus ab Asiae episcopis.*" (De Vir. Ill. cap. ix. ed. Vallarsi, ii. 829.)

The particulars as to the fast and the revelation, of which Jerome says "*ecclesiastica narrat historia,*" seem to be found in no extant writer except this Fragment. Eusebius only says what he states on the authority of Clement, and in H. E. iii. 24 he mentions points as to the relation of the fourth Gospel to the other three which Jerome has transferred into his book De Viris Illustribus, c. ix. Eusebius says there that John wrote his Gospel *παρακληθέντα*: but he adds none of the circumstances for which Jerome refers to some apparently well-known authority.

The account of Victorinus Petavionensis, at the close of the third century, deserves to be compared. "*Nam et evangelium postea scripsit. Cum essent Valentinus et Cherinthus et Ebion, et caeteri scholae Sathanae diffusi per orbem, convenerunt ad illum de finitimis provinciis omnes [episcopi additur in Scholiis Victorini ad Apocalyps.] et compulerunt ut ["et" addunt eadem Scholia] ipse testimonium conscriberet.*" (Cited by Routh, i. 408, e Biblioth. Paris. PP. i. 1253.)

- § 5. 10<sup>a</sup> l. 16. *et ideo licit uaria sin-  
culis euangeliorum libris principia  
doceantur Nihil tamen differt creden-  
tium fidei cum uno ac principali spiritu de  
20. clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui-  
tate de passione de resurrectione  
de conuersatione cum decipulis suis  
ac de gemino eius aduentu  
primo in humilitate dispectus quod—  
25. —secundum potestate regali pre-  
clarum quod faturum est.*

The errors of transcription in these lines are such as need not call for any remark. They would not confuse any moderately attentive reader in the least. The erased letters at the end of line 24 and the beginning of the next seem certainly to be “fotu;” the writer having begun after *quod* to write *foturum*, which follows that word in line 26, and then having seen his mistake and erased the letters, but without supplying *fuit*, which seems to be needed. This may shew what confusion may have been produced in any part of the MS. by omissions such as *very nearly* took place here, by passing on from the first to the second *quod*.

Westcott says of this sentence, “The whole passage from *et ideo—futurum est* comes in very abruptly, and has no connection with what precedes, which could be expressed by *ideo*; and similarly what follows is not connected with it by *ergo*.” This may probably be another fragment; although we cannot be sure what term in the original is rendered by *ideo* (which in the Vulgate in 2 Cor. i. 20 is the rendering of the ancient reading *διό*, and in ii. 9 of *εἰς τοῦτο*). The following *ergo* may be connected with these lines, as shewing *what wonder therefore if John should so write*, since the Godhead and manhood of Christ are alike set forth in the Gospels. But if Westcott’s suggestion be approved of, that the Muratorian Canon originally formed part of a dialogue, then the fragmentary character of the extracts is quite natural; we should thus have the expressions of one speaker without the interspersed remarks of the other.

The “*varia principia*” taught in the respective Gospels seem to be the different points of Christian truth as to our Lord’s incarnation, passion, resurrection, intercourse with his disciples, and his two advents.

“*Nihil tamen differt, οὐδὲν διαφέρει τῇ—πίστει.*” Westcott: similarly in the Greek restoration given by Bunsen and in that of Hilgenfeld.

l. 19. “*Principali*] Forsan Graece scriptum fuerat *ἡγεμονικῶ*. Philoxeni glossa est, *ἡγεμονικόν, principale.*” Routh. “*Principalis* is used to translate *ἡγεμονικὸς* in Ps. li. 12 Vulg., and Iren. c. Haer. III. 11. 8 [bis].” Westcott (p. 188 n.). A similar rendering is given in Bunsen and by Hilgenfeld. A similar *explanation* is given by Van Gilse, although he does not admit a Greek original.

The similarity of the expressions in lines 23–26 to those of Tertullian (Apologeticum 21, ed. Oehler, i. 200) shews how common such phraseology then was amongst Christians. In speaking of the Jews he says, “*Duobus enim adventibus eius significatis, primo, qui iam expunctus est in humilitate conditionis humanae, secundo, qui concludendo saeculo imminet in sublimitate divinitatis exertae; primum non intellegendo, secundum, quem manifestius praedicatum sperant, unum existimaverunt.*”

l. 23. *adventu*. "*advento*. The relatives and adjectives which follow shew that this was a neuter form answering to *eventum*, *inventum*, &c. Possibly it occurs also in Ter. Phorm. I. 3. 2." Westcott.

l. 24. "*primo*," corrected by Westcott into *primum*, in accordance with "*secundum*" and "*praeclarum*" in the following member of the sentence. Routh, on the contrary, corrects *secundo* and *praeclaro*; in which he is followed by Credner (1847), and Bunsen. Van Gilse and Credner (1860) have *secundo* and *praeclarus*. Volkmar *secundo* and *praeclarum*. Wieseler gives *primus* in line 24, and *secundus* and *praeclarus* in lines 25, 26.

l. 24. "*despectus*," altered by Routh into *despectum* vel *despectui*; by Bunsen into *despecto*. "*despectûs*" Westcott. Volkmar omits the word.

l. 25. Van Gilse changes "*futurum*" to *futurus*, in this following Wieseler.

§ 6. 10<sup>a</sup> l. 26.

*quid ergo*

*mirum si Johannes tam constanter*

*sincula etiam in epistulis suis proferat*

*dicens in semeipsu Quae uidimus oculis*

30. *nostris et auribus audiuiimus et manus*

*nostrae palpauerunt haec scripsimus*

*uobis*

l. 27. "*tam constanter*] h. e. *tam fidenter, et asseveranter*. *Gloss. Vet.* *constanter*, εὐσταθῶς, θαρρουντῶς." Routh.

l. 28. "*in epistulis suis*" of course may mean the one Epistle from which the quotation is given.

l. 29. "*in semeipsu*." "*in semetipso*. καθ' ἑαυτοῦ. Perhaps it may be better to read *in semetipsum*." Westcott. "*In semetipso*. Optime Routhius hanc dictionem explicavit verbis Tertulliani, de Pud. cap. 18 [Oehler, i. 834], 'nam hoc etiam in sua persona Apostolus statuit,' quibus junguntur deinceps Pauli verba ex 1 Tim. i. desumta." Van Gilse. *In semetipso* may be in contrast to the Gospel, in which, according to the account here given, the testimony of St. John was not merely personal, but that in which he and others were conjoined.

ll. 29-32. The citation from 1 John i. is a combination of verses 1, 3, and 4, in which the expressions of both parts are blended; *quae* ver. 3, *uidimus oculis nostris* 1, et [auribus] *audiuimus* 3, et *manus nostrae palpauerunt* 1, *haec scripsimus vobis* 4. In the Vulgate ἐψηλάφησαν is rendered by *contrectauerunt*, (or in the Codex Amiatinus *tentauerunt*); but *palpauerunt*

as here found occurs three times in citations by Jerome and in Victorinus. It may have been taken by the translator of this Fragment from some Latin copy of this Epistle, or he may have used it as the most appropriate rendering of the Greek word; as in Luke xxiv. 39. "Scripsimus" is the reading of Cod. Amiat. in ver. 4.

I was surprised, when tracing the MS. at Milan, that the concluding word *vobis* (below at the end of the page) had been overlooked by all who had previously copied or collated it; the passage in St. John might almost have suggested that the word is concealed in the small letters below at the end of the line: I found afterwards that Wieseler had read BJS; but Volkmar thought that these letters were only a mark of the collator, and not anything that he had copied; and others passed them by entirely.

10<sup>b</sup> l. 1. *Sic enim non solum visurem sed (et) auditorem  
sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordi  
nem profetetur*

l. 1. "sed et;" the word "et" added above the line seems to be instead of "d;" this gives the reading adopted by Routh, Credner (1847), Van Gilse, Bunsen, and others, *se et*. Credner (1860) gives "sed et auditorem *se et* scriptorem." Westcott and Hilgenfeld have "[*se*] sed et auditorem sed et scriptorem." Volkmar retains "sed et" twice, without regarding the correction in the MS. as to the first.

l. 2. It is remarkable that two collators of this Fragment should have read dñs (Dominus), instead of Dñi (Domini).

Something may be even learned from the *order* in which the Gospels are mentioned in the Fragment. Westcott says (p. 188), "As bearing upon the authorship of the Fragment, it may be noticed that the order of the Gospels is not that of the *African* Church, in which, according to the oldest authorities, Matthew and John stood first. And if the Fragment was not of African origin, it follows almost certainly that it was not originally written in Latin. There is no evidence of the existence of Christian Latin literature out of Africa till about the close of the second century."

From the manner in which the first Epistle of John is quoted in close connection with his Gospel, it appears as if it had in some manner been circulated in connection with it, and not as part of some other collection of books, nor yet as a separate writing. If, as it appears, this be so, it follows that the Epistle is apparently addressed to the same persons and communities as had united in requesting him to write his narrative of our Lord's life and actions.

§ 7. 10<sup>b</sup> 1. 3.*Acta autem omnium apostolorum**sub uno libro scribta sunt [.] Lucas obtime Theofi*

5. *le conprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula  
gerebantur Sicut et semote passionem petri  
euidenter declarat. Sed et pauli ab ur  
be ad spaniam proficescentis.*

1. 4. “sub uno libro scripta sunt.” These words (which end the sentence) seem to be suggested by the beginning of the book of Acts, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμην, as though the writer had now to mention τὸν δευτέρου λόγον of Luke: one book of his work addressed to Theophilus being devoted to the actions and teaching of our Lord, and *one* (the second) *book* to the Acts of the Apostles.

11. 4, 5. “obtime Theophile”—“should almost certainly be ‘optime Theophilo.’ The phrase ‘optime Theophile’ is found in the Preface to the Gospels, and not in the dedication of the Acts, and could not therefore be used as the title of the latter book.” Westcott, 417. Routh proposes *optime [ea] Theophilo*, and then retains “*quia*.” Credner and Van Gilse have *optimo Theophilo*; and in line 5 “*quia*” is changed into *quae*. Volkmar has “*optime Theophile*” as a quotation, and retains “*quia*<sup>d</sup>.” Westcott (as above) “*optime Theophilo*,” and he keeps *quia*. Bunsen has *optimo Theophilo* and *quoad*; Hilgenfeld agrees with him (and others) in the former place, but in the latter he retains “*quia*.” I feel no hesitation that “*quia*” in line 5 should be *quae*; but I see no need for altering the reading “*optime Theophile*,” which can scarcely be anything but a quotation from Luke i. 3, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε. If any change were needed, it would be best to take *optimo Theophilo*, so as to keep up the allusion. Westcott’s objection does not seem to me convincing; for the phrase appears to have to do with the person addressed; and the peculiarity of the expression vouches, I think, for its genuineness. The writer might regard the Gospel and Acts as two λόγοι of *one work*.

The expressions of Jerome, De Viris Illust. vii., “Evangelium sicut audierat, scripsit; Acta vero Apostolorum sicut viderat, composuit,” seem almost taken from this passage and lines 6, 7 of p. 10<sup>a</sup>. “Lucas ex opinione conscripsit—Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne—et idem prout assequi potuit.” Acta Apostolorum . . . “comprendit quae sub praesentia

<sup>d</sup> But he regards the word as a neuter plural relative. “Sollten wir nicht ein neutr. plur. von *quis* haben, in dem Sinne von *quaecunque*?

Aehnlich is *ὅτι* von *ὅστις* und *quod* von *qui* gerade so gut Relativ als Conjunction.” (In Credner’s N. T. Kanon, p. 346.)

ejus singula gerebantur:" rather than from Eusebius, H. E. iii. 4: Λουκᾶς . . . ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑποδείγματα θεοπνεύστοις καταλέλοιπε βιβλίοις· τῷ τε εὐαγγελίῳ ὃ καὶ χαράξαι μαρτύρεται καθὰ παρέδοντο αὐτῷ . . . καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεσιν, ἃς οὐκ ἔτι δι' ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς παραλαβὼν, συνετάξατο. But it seems clear that the remark of the author of the Fragment and the similar statement of Eusebius and Jerome, that in the book of Acts Luke wrote as an eye-witness, can only apply in any strict sense to the latter portion.

ll. 6-8. "*semote—proficescentis*. This sentence is evidently corrupt. If the general character of the errors of the manuscript had been favourable to the changes, it would have been the simplest correction to read *semota passione . . . sed et profectione . . . proficescentis*, i. e. the narrative was that (in the main) of an eye-witness, as he evidently shews by setting aside without notice events so remarkable as the martyrdom of Peter, and even the last great journey of Paul. Perhaps by reading *semota, declarant* a fair sense may be obtained. The personal narrative of St. Luke deals with part of the Apostolic history, just as detached allusions clearly point to the martyrdom of Peter (John xxi. 18, 19), and even the journey of Paul to Spain (Rom. xv. 24 ff.). It is, however, more likely that some words have been lost at the end of the sentence, such as *significat scriptura*." Westcott.

The only corrections given by Routh are for "*semote*," *remota*; and for "*declarat*," *declarant*. *Semota* and *declarant* are adopted by Credner (1847); in 1860, however, he retains "*declarat*;" "Wir haben es hier mit einem Gracismus zu thun, das *neutr. plur.* mit dem *verb. in sing.*"

Van Gilse has "*semotam passionem*;" and for "*sed profectionem*," *et profect*.

Bunsen reads "*sicut deesse non modo passionem Petri*," &c. Hilgenfeld makes no change, but he supposes the passage to be truncated; Volkmar too alters nothing, only he adds "*n*" after *proficescentis*.

It is probably best to make no change or supposed correction; for all the difficulty may arise simply from the obscurity of the translation from the Greek. Luke (writing as an eye-witness) evidently declares as apart from his object the martyrdom of St. Peter, and also the journey of St. Paul from Rome to Spain [by not mentioning them at all]. There is doubtless a tacit allusion to John xxi. 18, 19, and Rom. xv. 24: is there also to 2 Pet. i. 14, where Peter speaks of his own approaching martyrdom?

"Ab urbe" indicates the *Roman* character of the document. To a Roman Christian no events would seem more worthy of commemoration than the martyrdom of St. Peter and the Spanish journey of St. Paul,

when he thus carried the Gospel to the regions beyond them: and as these events are intimated in other parts of the New Testament, it seemed to the writer needful to account for St. Luke's silence respecting them. This is perhaps the earliest extant historical notice of St. Peter's martyrdom; that this took place at Rome is so attested as a fact, that it may be well a cause of surprise that any one has been bold enough to doubt it. The testimony of Tertullian, born in the second century, might be thought sufficient: "Ista quam felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt; ubi Petrus passioni Domini adaequatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur . . . ." *De Praes. Haer.* 36. "Romani . . . quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt." *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5. His contemporary Caius speaks of the well-known graves of these two Apostles: ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι. εἰς γὰρ θελήσης ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανόν, ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὡστίαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἰδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. (*Ap. Eus. H. E.* ii. 25.) Dionysius of Corinth (cir. A. D. 180), writing to the Roman Church, says: ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοσαύτης νοουθεσίας, τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτεῖαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς, ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες, ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν. (*Ap. Eus. H. E.* ii. 25.)

Thus St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome was to a Roman in that age one of the marked events of Apostolic history. St. Paul's journey to Spain (though in accordance with his own avowed intention) has far less of historical attestation, though referred to by the author of the Fragment as a fact. But his reaching to the bounds of the west, as mentioned by Clement of Rome, can hardly be limited to his coming to Italy: διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών. (*cap.* v.) Any one writing from Rome would by such a phrase intend regions yet more westward. It is, however, only the imagination of later ages that has carried that Apostle's scene of labour as far as Britain: in utter contradiction of all genuine British traditions.

§ 8. 10<sup>b</sup> l. 8.

*Epistulae autem*

*Pauli quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directe*

10. *sint uolentibus intellegere ipse declarant(ur)*

l. 9. "directe," and 10. "ipse." *Directae* and *ipsae* Freindaller (quoted by Routh), Van Gilse, Credner, Volkmar, Westcott, Hilgenfeld. *directae* and *ipse* (unchanged) Routh and Bunsen. *Declarantur* seems to be what the MS. indicates in the contracted termination: this is, I think, another

indication of a Greek original; such a word as *δηγοῦνται* might be translated, by one who thought more of the form than of the sense, by a Latin passive. Routh, who retains “ipse,” says, “Malim ego reponere *declarat* pro *declarant*, propter verbum *interdicens* in sequentibus;” Bunsen too has *ipse declarat*.

Westcott regards the sentence beginning “Epistolae autem” as another fragmentary portion.

- 10<sup>b</sup> l. 11. *Primum omnium corintheis scysmae heresis in  
terdicens deinceps B callactis circumcissione  
Romanis autem ordine scripturarum sed (et)  
principium earum esse Christum intimans*  
15. *prolexius scripsit de quibus sincolis neces  
se est ad nobis desputari*

The corrections *Corinthiis* and *Galatis* for “Corintheis” and “Callactis” need no remark, as mere blunders of the copyist: Credner’s notice (1847) that the city of Calacta, in Sicily, might be better known to the *author* (dem Verfasser) than was Galatia, savours more of refinement than verisimilitude.

l. 11. “scysmae heresis” is read by general consent *schisma haeresis*<sup>e</sup>; “Formula verborum insolentior. Graece σχίσμα τῆς αἰρέσεως.” Routh.

l. 12. B after “deinceps” has generally been passed by unnoticed: but this seems to be the Greek numeral letter retained by the translator<sup>f</sup>: the Epistle to the Galatians stands *second* in order of those *here* specified.

— “circumcissione,” *-nem*; the line omitted above *e*.

l. 13. “ordine,” *ordinem*, Van Gilse, Credner, Volkmar, Bunsen, Hilgenfeld. A change which can only have a meaning by connecting this with “intimans,” which follows; otherwise it becomes a thing *forbidden* by the Apostle. Routh and Westcott rightly make no change. “Ordine scripturarum] h. e. ni fallor, Scripturas Vet. Test. ordine adhibito, sive alias post alias, interpretatus, fuse disseruit. Atque ait Freindaller, ‘Verba, ordine scripturarum, non videntur quid innuere aliud, quam Paulum hoc

<sup>e</sup> But in the form “scysmae” the copyist seems to have treated “schisma” as a Lat. fem. of the first declension. May he not have meant “schismatis haereses?” When the Emperor Sigismund, prior to the Council of Constance, spoke of the need of destroying “hanc nefandam schismam,” he does not seem to have been ori-

ginal in his solecism. (Comp. the mediaeval use of *Biblia*.)

<sup>f</sup> In the Codex Boernerianus (written by a Western scribe) the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is described in the Greek line δευτερη B.

loco rationes suas, e lege veteri pro stabilienda nova protulisse, huicque illam *ordine* subjecisse.’” Routh.

“et” at the end of the line does not appear to be intentionally erased.

l. 14. After “intimans,” some have sought to supply what would fill up the vacant space. Karl Wieseler, followed by Hilgenfeld, adds *Paulus*; Credner (1860) *Ephesiis*; Volkmar, *aliis*: but there would be no end of critical conjecture if it were thought needful to fill up lines which in a MS. are left shorter than the rest.

l. 15. *singulis* of course. Before “necesse” *non* is added by Bunsen and Volkmar; Credner (1860) adds it after.

“The reference appears to be to the Treatise from which the Fragment is taken.” Westcott. l. 16. *a nobis*.

There was evidently some reason in the mind of the writer which led him to specify the *contents* of these three Epistles before speaking of the collection of St. Paul’s Epistles (in which these are again included) addressed to seven Churches. Possibly by “de quibus singulis necesse est a nobis disputari” he means nothing more than that of these three he gives a remark on the subject-matter, so as to bear on three especial points of importance in the middle of the second century: *schism*, as found in the actings of false teachers and party leaders, who would turn Christianity into schools of philosophy; *Judaizing*, as shewn in the Ebionites and all who held or practised the Galatian errors; and, on the other hand, the *rejection of the Old Testament*, by Marcion or others; to which the Romans replies by its constant use of Old Testament Scripture from which the doctrines of Christ were taught, and to which the appeals of the Apostle were so confidently made (see xv. 4, xvi. 26). The *ordo scripturarum* in the Epistle to the Romans may be noted, in that it contains *fifty-one* citations from the Old Testament; while the other Epistles to which St. Paul’s name is prefixed, taken together, have but *forty-three*, of which five are in the Ephesians, one in 1 Timothy, and all the rest in the Galatians and the two to the Corinthians.

There was hardly a single subject of controversy in the middle of the second century which was not met by some one of the three Epistles selected by the author of the Fragment for particular notice.

§ 9. 10<sup>b</sup> l. 16.

*Cum ipse beatus*

*Apostolus Paulus sequens prodecessoris sui*

*Johannis ordinem nonnisi nominatim semptaem*

*ecclesiis scribat ordine tali a corinthios*

20. *prima . ad efesios seconda ad philippinses ter*

*tia ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quinta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta . ad romanos septima Uerum corintheis et thesaolecensibus licet pro correptione iteretur una*  
 25. *tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia deffusa esse denoscitur*

l. 17. "prodecessoris;" this was edited by Muratori "*praedecessoris*," and it is therefore copied from him by Routh and Van Gilse; the same is adopted as a correction by Credner, Volkmar, Bunsen, and Hilgenfeld: but Westcott says (p. 477), that "prodecessoris" is probably a genuine form. I should compare it with "proscriptus" (Gal. iii. 1) in the Codex Claromontanus, which is too strongly supported by the citations of Victorinus, Augustine, Bede, and others, to be cast aside summarily as a mere blunder for "praescriptus." It cannot be that the author thought that St. John saw and wrote the Apocalypse before St. Paul had written his Epistles: the explanation seems to be that John, who wrote to seven Churches (with whom in that respect Paul was compared), had been previously spoken of by the writer as the author of the Gospel and his first Epistle.

The names of the Churches to whom the Epistles were written are of course to be corrected, and "a corinthios" is "*ad Cor.*," *Ephesios*, *Philippenses*, *Colossenses*, *Galatas*, *Thessalonicenses*. *Corinthiis*, *Thessalonicensibus*.  
 l. 24. *correptione*.

In l. 20 seq. Routh suggests that "prima," "seconda," &c. should be *primo*, *secundo*, &c.; Van Gilse adopts this: Bunsen has *primam*, *secundam*, &c. Credner, Volkmar, Westcott, and Hilgenfeld retain "prima," "seconda," &c.; these nominatives appear here like a list of the *titles* of the Epistles, not therefore governed by "scribat," as if "*which are these*" (or something of the kind) had introduced the list.

The order in which the Churches are arranged is, I believe, singular. Volkmar exhibits them thus:—

<i>a[d] Corinthios prima.</i>	<i>ad Colosenses quarta.</i>
<i>ad Efesios seconda.</i>	<i>ad Galatas quinta.</i>
<i>ad Philippenses tertia.</i>	<i>ad Thessalonicenses sexta.</i>
<i>ad ROMANOS septima.</i>	

As if the Epistle to the Romans were a kind of climax of the teaching of the Apostle.

ll. 23, 24. "Verum Corinthiis . . . iteretur" appears to be a parenthetical clause as intended by the writer. Paul wrote by name to *seven* Churches (although he wrote twice to two of them), as shewing that the Church spread through the whole earth is *one*. He sees a mystical unity in the Catholic Church (the name which he employs below) shadowed forth in the number *seven*.

10<sup>b</sup> l. 26.

*et Johannis enim in a*

*pocalebsy licet septem eccleseis scribat*

*tamen omnibus dicit*

Read *Johannes* and *Apocalypsi*.

This remark of the writer connecting the Epistles of John to the seven Churches with all, is evidently based on the sentence, ὁ ἔχων οὐς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, which occurs in the conclusion of the address to *each* Church, in the three former cases *preceding* the passage ὁ νικῶν or τῷ νικούντι, and *following* it in the four latter.

Victorinus Petavionensis (circa A. D. 200), in his Commentary on the Apocalypse (cap. i.), says:—"In toto orbe septem ecclesias omnes esse, et septem nominatas, unam esse catholicam Paullus docuit. Et primum quidem ut servaret et ipse typum septem ecclesiarum, non excessit numerum. Sed scripsit ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Thessalonicenses, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses. Postea singularibus personis scripsit, ne excederet modum septem ecclesiarum. Et in brevi contrahens praedicationem suam ad Timotheum sic ait, Ut scias, qualiter debeas conversari in ecclesia Dei vivi." (ap. Routh, i. 417.)

Cyprian also: "Apostolus Paulus, qui hujus numeri legitimi et certi meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. Et in Apocalypsi Dominus mandata sua divina et praecepta caelestia ad septem ecclesias et earum angelos dirigit." (p. 270. Baluze.) "Paulus septem ecclesiis scripsit, et Apocalypsis ecclesias septem ponit, ut servetur septenarius numerus." (p. 281. Baluze.) "Recte monuit Freindaller epistolas Apocalypticas saeculo secundo jam habitas fuisset *catholicas*, id est, tales, quae ad universam (ὅλην) ecclesiam directae fuerint." (Routh, p. 417.)

Perhaps it may be worthy of inquiry whether the number *seven* and the notion of *Catholicity* are at all connected with the designation Catholic Epistles which we commonly give to a collection of that number.

The phrase "The Catholic Church" (l. 30), ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, has what may be called its germ in Acts ix. 31, ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας, by applying the same thought and the similar

expression to the Church, καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης. This connection of the phrase and the thing with Acts ix. 31 has been lost sight of through the vulgar and modern reading in the plural, αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας . . . εἶχον οἰκοδομοῦμεναι, &c.: all of which with what follows to ἐπληθύνετο (not -νουντο) should be in the singular. Bede says on this passage (Retractatio in Act. Apost.), "*Ecclesia quidem per totam Judaeam et Galilaeam et Samariam habebat pacem*] Ubi Latine dicitur per totam, in Graeco habetur καθόλης. Unde notandum, quod ex eo *catholica* cognominatur ecclesia, quod per totum orbem diffusa in una pace versetur." (Ed Giles, xii. 133)g.

§ 10. 10<sup>b</sup> l. 28.

*Uerum ad Filemonem una*

*et at titum una et ad tymotheum duas pro affec*

30. *to et dilectione in honore tamen ecclesiae ca*  
*tholice in ordinatione ecclesiastice*

11<sup>a</sup>.

*discipline sanctificate sunt*

The sentence which is read "in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt," is a good specimen of the confusion by the scribe of such terminations in *-e* and *ae*.

ll. 28, 29. "*duas*] It seems best to change the preceding *una*, *una*, into *unam*, *unam*, than to regard this as a nominative, which, however, probably occurs below [11<sup>a</sup> l. 7]. The *tamen* in the following clause implies the opposition of *scripsit* or the like." Westcott. But it may be questioned whether *tamen* is used in any very strict sense by the writer throughout the Fragment; and the prima, secunda, &c., lines 20—24, are quite in keeping with the nominatives here. "*Una, una, duae*," is the reading of Routh, Credner (1847), Van Gilse, Bunsen, Hilgenfeld. *Una, una, duas* (as in the MS.), Credner 1860 (see note), and Volkmar. Westcott says below, on l. 11<sup>a</sup> 7, "Credner is, I believe, right in regarding *duas* as a feminine substantive formed like *trias*." This, it appears to me, holds good in both places.

ll. 29, 30. Volkmar seems to be peculiar in altering "affecto" (according to the analogy of the copyist's mistakes) into *affectu*. l. 30. Bunsen reads *honorem*. l. 31. Van Gilse reads *ordinationem*, and Bunsen "*et in ordinationem*."

<sup>g</sup> Irenaeus (C. H. iii. 11. 8), in a passage to be cited in Part IV. § 2, speaks of τέσσαρα καθολικά πνεύματα, and of τέσσαρες καθολικαὶ διαθήκαι.

§ 11. 11<sup>a</sup> l. 1.*Fertur etiam ad*

*Laudecenses alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fincte ad heresem Marcionis et alia plura quae in catholicam ecclesiam recepi non*

5. *potest Fel enim cum melle misceri non con-  
cruit*

l. 1. "Fertur" is used as answering to *φέρεται*.

l. 2. "Laudecenses." In the Codex Boernerianus (G of St. Paul's Epistles), subjoined to the Epistle to Philemon, is a title merely in which the name is thus spelled:

ad laudicenses incipit epistola  
*προς λαουδακησας αρχεται επιστολη*

Routh reads "*Laodicenses alia alia ad Alex.*" So too Westcott; in repeated words one is most easily omitted: but the added *alia* does not seem needful for the sense. It appears impossible to suppose that the cento of phrases from St. Paul's genuine Epistles, often found in Latin MSS. under the name of *Epistola ad Laodicenses*, is here intended. There was a document known under this name in the time of Jerome: "*Legunt quidam et ad Laodicenses, sed ab omnibus exploditur.*" (De Vir. Ill. v.) The reference to *Marcion* is here probably the clue; the writer seems to have intended the Epistle to the Ephesians, which Marcion altered, and to which he gave this name, either as part of his changes, or it may be from having obtained his copy of it from Laodicea. The plural "*finctae*" shews that this Epistle to the Laodiceans, as well as that to the Alexandrians, had been put forth in St. Paul's name in connection with the heresy of Marcion.

But what is the *Epistola ad Alexandrinos*? It appears to me to be one of those early writings of heretics which would for ever have been forgotten, had not the names been preserved in such a list as this. Wieseler, Credner (1860), Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, and others, identify it with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Westcott says, "*Ad haeresim, i. e. πρὸς αἵρεσιν, bearing upon, whether against it or otherwise.*" The allusion seems to be to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*." But this appears to me an unsuitable explanation of "*ad haeresim*;" especially as no one could have forged an Epistle in the name of St. Paul avowedly against Marcion; and here the writer is speaking only of things which he regarded as "*fel*:" how differently he speaks below of the Shepherd of Hermas!

The supposition that the Epistle to the Hebrews *must* have been here

intended, seems to rest solely on the certainty that the writer at Rome unquestionably knew of that book, and therefore *could* not have passed it by in silence. But the first Epistle of Peter, which was universally received, is not mentioned. "The cause of the omissions cannot have been ignorance or doubt. It must be sought either in the character of the writing, or in the present condition of the text." Westcott (p. 191); who also says, "Nothing is known of the *Epistle to the Alexandrians*. The attempt to identify it with that to the Hebrews is not supported by the slightest evidence." (p. 190, *note*.) That is (when looked at in connection with what has been previously cited), he thinks the allusion is to the Epistle to the Hebrews; but even so thinking, he freely states it to be a matter of *opinion*, not of evidence. Credner had said in 1847, "Die Vermuthung, dass damit unser Hebraerbrief gemeint sei entbehrt aller innern Wahrscheinlichkeit und Begründung." (p. 88.)

The opinion formed by some that the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to those of that nation living at Alexandria, seems to have helped them to identify that Epistle with this, which the author of the Fragment rejected as something deadly. But that opinion is in itself very unsuitable; for, so far from the Egyptian Jews adhering to the worship of the one sanctuary of God at Jerusalem, they had their own schismatical temple at Heliopolis or Leontopolis. As to what has been said about the divine service mentioned in the Hebrews not being in accordance with that of the temple at Jerusalem, and therefore more like that in Egypt, it is not to be forgotten that it is the service of the *tabernacle*, and not that of the temple, which the writer discusses.

ll. 4, 5. "recipi non potest.] Ad formam Graeci sermonis, παραλαμβάνεσθαι οὐ δυνατόν ἐστι." Routh. ἀποδέχεσθαι οὐ δυνατόν ἐστιν is proposed in the Greek restoration published by Bunsen: ἀποδέχεσθαι οὐκ ἔξεστιν in that of Hilgenfeld. It is only those who deny a Greek original who fail to see that it is thus we find the verb *potest* in the singular: Credner (1847) allowed, "Potest führt auf einen Gracismus." Volkmar says, "Wie *duas* neben *trias* auch in lat. Munde bestehen konnte, so konnte dieser auch *alia plura, quae recepi non potest* um so leichter sagen, als die Pluralität besonders ausgedrückt war, in einem Relativsatze gar" (p. 358 *n.*): an opinion which may be compared with his that the MS. is so very correct. Van Gilse changes "potest" into *possunt*, saying, "non nisi mendum est, cujus originem recte ut videtur, Wieselerus indicavit in proximo illo *quae*, quod singularis esse numeri putabat scriba ignarus ac sordidus." But admit that we have a translation from Greek, and all these refinements become needless.

l. 5. “*Fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.*” Appeal is made to the paronomasia of *fel* and *mel* by those who assert that Latin is the original language of the Fragment. But what if it can be shewn that this is itself almost a quotation from a Greek writer well known by the author of the Fragment? In illustration of this adage, a quotation has been given (first, I believe, by Simon de Magistris) from the Shepherd of Hermas. The passage is, ἐὰν γὰρ λαβὼν ἀψινθίου μικρὸν λίαν εἰς κεράμιον μέλιτος ἐπιχέης, οὐχὶ ὅλον τὸ μέλι ἀφανίζεται; <sup>h</sup>καὶ πικρὸν λίαν μικρὸν ἀπόλλυσι τὴν γλυκύτητα τοῦ μέλιτος, καὶ οὐκέτι τὴν αὐτὴν χάριν ἔχει παρὰ τῷ δεσπότῃ, ὅτι ἐπικράνθη καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτοῦ ἀπώλεσεν; (Mand. v. 1.) It can hardly be doubted that the writer had these words of Hermas in his mind. It has also been noted that the similarity of sound, *fel*, *mel*, may imitate *χολή*, *μέλι*.

§ 12. 11<sup>a</sup> l. 6.

*epistola sane Jude et superscriptio*

*Johannis duas in catholica habentur*

*Superscripti* of course; see Westcott's remarks on this word, p. 26. Van Gilse<sup>i</sup>, Credner (1847), *superscriptae*; Credner (1860) *superscriptionis* or *superscriptione*; Bunsen *supra scripti*. A fatal objection to this word being made to signify two *letters superscribed* with the name of John, is that he does not prefix his name. “*Duas*” requires no change: the two Epistles here referred to seem to be the *second* and *third*. It is, however, not to be overlooked that some seem to ascribe but two Epistles to John: speaking of the *first* as the *former* προτέρα, and quoting the *second* as though it were part of the first. But this writer seems to distinguish these two from that which he had quoted before.

l. 7. “in catholica.] Graece ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ, et subaudita, ut interdum fit, voce ἐκκλησία; quod imitati sunt Latini scriptores.” Routh; who, amongst other passages, refers to Tertullian De Praescr. Haer. xxx., “constat illos . . . in catholicae primo doctrinam credidisse apud ecclesiam Romanensem sub episcopatu Eleutheri benedicti.” “*In Catholica*, scil. Ecclesia.” Van Gilse. “The context, on the other hand, favours the correction *in catholicis*.” Westcott. So Bunsen, “among the Catholic Epistles,” who considers the other Catholic Epistles to have been passed by: “The *sane* (certainly) indicates that the author or copyist has left out the undisputed or less disputed Catholic Epistles: the first of St. Peter, that

<sup>h</sup> To the end of the sentence Pseudo-Athanasius gives, καὶ τοσοῦτον μέλι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐλαχίστου ἀψινθίου ἀπόλλυται;

<sup>i</sup> “*Superscriptae Joannis sunt epistolae quae Joannis nomen superscripti habent.*” Van Gilse.

of St. James, and the first of St. John: of which last he had besides given already a quotation. Our words relate to the disputed Epistles: of these he admits the Epistle of Jude and the two (others) of St. John." Bunsen, Hippolytus, ii. 136 (1852). The Greek reconstruction published by Bunsen has ἐν καθολικαῖς; that of Hilgenfeld, ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ (ἐκκλησίᾳ?).

Another suggestion as to this passage was sent to me in 1860 by Dr. William Fitzgerald, then Bishop of Cork, now of Killaloe. In notes which he made for his own use he says, "*In Catholica* might be a mistake for *in Catholicam*, and this a barbarous rendering of πρὸς τῇ καθολικῇ, *besides the Catholic Epistle*."

But I believe that it is best to compare ἐν καθολικοῖς, Eus. H. E. iii. 3, where he speaks of certain spurious works not being so received. (See § 14, p. 56.)

§ 13. 11<sup>a</sup> l. 6.

*et sapi*

*entia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius  
scripta*

The word "et" has been supposed to be "ut<sup>k</sup>," on the ground that the book of Wisdom could only be here introduced in some way of comparison. So Credner, Wieseler, Van Gilse, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld. Credner says, "Die Sapientia Salomonis kann neben Briefen N. T.'s nur vergleichungsweise (*ut*) angezogen sein." Freindaller's note (as cited by Routh) is, "Qua ratione liber Sapientiae, nisi forte de diverso sermo sit, locum inter scripturas novi foederis hic nactus sit, critices aciem fugit." "It is difficult to understand this allusion if the text be sound." Westcott. Those who think the reading is "ut sapientia," and that a comparison is thus introduced, seem to find some difficulty in explaining clearly what it is: Van Gilse's long note on the passage is intended to shew that the second and third Epistles of John are spoken of as not written by the Apostle himself, but as manifesting his spirit and proceeding from one or more of his friends, like the book of Wisdom written by Solomon's friends in his honour, which (he says) can scarcely have any other meaning than this, "librum illum prorsus ad rationem Salomoneam esse compositum."

Bunsen does not change *et* into *ut*; but he supposes that there is here

<sup>k</sup> As an instance of *et* in Latin where the original Greek shews that *ut* is meant, the following may be taken: ἄδικος ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι καὶ τὸν κλαπέτα ἐλεύθερον τιμωρεῖς ὡς ἀδικησάντα (Test. Joseph. xiv. Grabe, Spicilegium, 240); where

the old Latin is, "Injustum est iudicium tuum quoniam et furatum liberum punis, *et* injuste agentem:" where the false reading *et* for *ut* very nearly reverses the sense.

a defect in the passage, and that after the Epistle to the Hebrews had been mentioned, it was compared with the book of Wisdom: "*nam et Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis,*" &c. In his attempted restoration of the text in Latin (and the Greek which he published with it), he supposes other books of the New Testament to be here omitted; of course any verbal restoration of *thirty-four* inserted words is not pretended; the passage in Greek and Latin only shews the *subjects* which he supposes to be here left out. In Bunsen's *Analecta Ante-Nicaena* (p. 152) the whole passage stands thus:—

Ἡ μὲν Ἰούδα ἐπιστολὴ καὶ αἱ τοῦ προειρη-  
μένον Ἰωάννου δύο ἐν καθολικαῖς ἔχονται [ἅμα  
τῇ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου πρώτῃ, καὶ τῇ Πέτρου  
καὶ τῇ Ἰακώβου. ἐπιστολὴ δὲ καθ' Ἑβραίους  
ἀφ' ἡμῶν οὐχ ὡς Παύλου ἀποστόλου οἶσα πα-  
ραλαμβάνεται, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὸ τινος αὐτοῦ φίλου  
ἢ μαθητοῦ γραφείσα ταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολαῖς  
προσθεῖσα ἔχεται]. καὶ ἡ Σοφία ὑπὸ φίλων  
Σαλομῶνος εἰς αὐτοῦ τιμὴν γέγραπται.

Epistola sane Judae et supra scripti Jo-  
hannis duae in catholicis habentur, [una  
cum eiusdem Johannis prima et Petri una  
et Jacobi. Epistola vero ad Hebraeos a  
plurimis ecclesiis non tamquam Pauli Apo-  
stoli recipitur, sed ut a quodam amico vel  
discipulo conscripta epistolis eius adiecta  
habetur]. Et Sapientia ab amicis Salo-  
monis in honorem ipsius scripta.

It will be noticed that Bunsen's own correction "*nam et*" (p. 128) does not here appear: also that in the Greek by the side of Bunsen's Latin restoration, the translator has in three places expressed something different. A conjectural insertion of a supposed lost clause cannot be intended to have any weight in itself: it is worth thus much, however—it shews where a break is believed to exist in the text, and what books of the New Testament we may be sure that the writer knew.

But although it may be difficult to give a satisfactory account of the mention of this book by the author of the Fragment, or to suggest *how* it was introduced (after a break, as I fully agree with others in supposing), it is not, I believe, fruitless to inquire what the sentence itself may mean.

The first question, then, is, What book is here intended? The Apocryphal book, *Wisdom of Solomon*, is of course that which the sentence at first suggests, and so I believe it is; but it is needful to notice on what grounds there has been a different interpretation given. For the name *Wisdom* was in and before the second century applied also to the Proverbs, as we see in Clement of Rome, who (cap. lvii.) with the words, οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία, introduces a quotation from Prov. i.; and from Melito, Παροιμίαι ἢ καὶ Σοφία (Eus. H. E. iv. 26). Thus, on the supposition that the reference was to the Proverbs, the latter part of the sentence ("*ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta*") was explained by the fact, that a portion of the Proverbs was written out

by "the men of Hezekiah," or, as it stands in the LXX, οἱ φίλοι Ἐζεκίου (xxv. 1)<sup>1</sup>.

This might seem to explain the mere words and phrases of the sentence, but the difficulty as to its introduction in this place would still remain.

But the Apocryphal book of Wisdom was *early* known by its present title, *Wisdom of Solomon*. Some indeed have thought that this was not the case, taking too strongly the note of Valesius on Euseb. H. E. v. 8: "Quippe *veteres omnes ecclesiastici scriptores Sapientiam Salomonis appellabant librum illum qui hodie Proverbia inscribitur. Liber autem ille qui titulum Sapientiae Salomonis hodie praefert ψευδεπίγραφος* est, teste Hieronymo, quamvis Eusebii aetate ita appellaretur." Clement of Alexandria, however, several times quotes this book under the name of Solomon, Strom. vi. 11, 14, 15 (pp. 786, 795, 800 Potter), and more often as Σοφία. But while Clement by implication gives the name *Wisdom of Solomon* to the Apocryphal book, this is done expressly by Tertullian, who says, "Porro facies Dei expectatur in simplicitate quaerendi, ut docet ipsa *Sophia*, non quidem Valentini sed *Salomonis*" (Adv. Valent. ii.). Elsewhere (e. g. De Praes. Haeret. vii.) he speaks of this book as the work of Solomon. Methodius, in the latter part of the third century, speaks of *this* book as ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία: thus, ἐν τῇ παναρέτῳ Σοφία . . . κρείσσον ἀτεκνία μετ' ἀρετῆς, &c., iv. 1, 2 (Conv. Virgg. i. 3. p. 69 Combefis, p. 13 Jahn). ἐν τῇ παναρέτῳ Σοφία φησί, Σποδὸς ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, &c., xv. 10 (Conv. Virgg. i. 7. p. 76 Combefis, p. 16 Jahn).

Thus, while the name πανάρετος Σοφία was applied both to the book of Proverbs and that of Wisdom, and παροιμίας ἢ καὶ Σοφία to the former, Σοφία Σαλομῶνος was a name used (as far as I know) exclusively for that which is commonly called *Wisdom of Solomon*.

<sup>1</sup> I was not aware that this had been previously supposed by any investigator of the Fragment, before I drew attention to the point in 1851 in a lecture published in the beginning of the following year, *On the Historic Evidence, &c. of the New Testament*. I there said, "What book is intended, is by no means clear, —whether the Apocryphal Book, or Proverbs, to which this name of Wisdom was applied in the second century;—a book the latter part of which was written out by the men of Hezekiah, and of which some chapters are the words of Agur and of king Lemuel." (p. 16.) In Bunsen's Hippolytus, published in the same year (1852), he gave (vol. ii. 138) a very similar

explanation; which is thus stated in his *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*, i. 127, 128 (1854): "Sapientiam a veteribus Proverbia Salomonis dici non est quod uberius exponam, ne lectores ignorantiae incusare videar: iis igitur quae de Sapientia habet Hegesippus [qui hunc Canonem, ut Bunsenio videtur, Graece conscripsit] a Salomonis amicis in ejus honorem conscripta, respicit ad Prov. xxv. 1, αὐται αἱ παιδείαι (al. παροιμίας) Σολομῶντος αἱ ἀδιάκριτοι, ἃς ἐξεγράψαντο οἱ φίλοι Ἐζεκίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Hunc locum male interpretatus Hegesippus, vel non bene memoria recolens, non Ezechiae sed Salomonis amicos Sapientiae auctores facit."

Now there is a sentence in Jerome's Preface to the books of Solomon which may throw light on this passage in the Fragment, or may receive some from it. He says, in speaking of the Apocryphal book of Wisdom, "Apud Hebraeos nusquam est, quin et ipse stylus Graecam eloquentiam redolet: *et nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judaei PHILONIS affirmant.*" After many years' study of the earlier Fathers, and much investigation of the subject of the Canon of the Old and New Testaments, and the reception of the Apocrypha, I cannot find this authorship of the book of Wisdom mentioned by any writer anterior to Jerome. But no doubt he had *some* ground for his assertion: may it not have been *this very sentence* in the Muratorian Fragment? The Greek *may* have stood thus:—καὶ ἡ Σοφία Σαλομῶνος ὑπὸ Φίλωνος εἰς τὴν τιμὴν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένη. It would be no cause for surprise if the Latin translator made the mistake of confounding Φίλωνος and φίλων, so as to translate *ab amicis* instead of *a Philone*, especially if the termination -ος were written (as is often the case in very early MSS.) in much smaller letters.

It has been shewn in the part which speaks of St. John's Gospel (p. 33), that Jerome quotes as from some early writer what is now found only in this Fragment; this, too, he seems to do here: this passage affords an independent (and therefore confirmatory) ground for holding that opinion. Each set of coincidences upholds the other.

If Jerome had this or a similar passage before him, he might easily have introduced the epithet *Judaeus* by a sort of unconscious amplification from familiarity with the name of *that* Philo.

There are passages in the early part of the book of Wisdom which seem as if they had been written after the introduction of Christianity<sup>m</sup>; indeed, the references are less marked in the Epistle of Mara son of Serapion (Cureton's Spicilegium Syriacum, p. 70) than they are here. Our Lord is there only designated covertly "the wise King." The writer of the book of Wisdom may on purpose keep leading Christian truths (such as the incarnation, the vicarious death, and the resurrection of our Lord) out of sight, and thus weakly endeavour to philosophize Christianity. It might thus be the production of some uninspired writer of the name of

<sup>m</sup> Thus Hippolytus, Ἀποδεικτικὴ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους, cites the book of Wisdom in all good faith as a prophecy: φέρω δὴ ἐς μέσον καὶ τὴν προφητείαν Σολομών . . . λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης, οὐ διελογίσαντο οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, περὶ χριστοῦ εἰπόντες ὀρθῶς ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἔστιν καὶ ἐναντιοῦται τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ τοῖς λόγοις ἡμῶν καὶ ὀνειδίζει ἡμῖν

ἀμαρτήματα νόμον καὶ ἐπαγγέλλεται γνώσιν ἔχειν θεοῦ καὶ παῖδα θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει κ. τ. λ. (cap. 9): where Sap. ii. is cited. Καὶ πάλιν Σολομὼν περὶ χριστοῦ καὶ Ἰουδαίων φησὶν ὅτι "Ὅτε στήσεται ὁ δίκαιος ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ κ. τ. λ. (cap. 10): where much is given from several verses of Sap. v.

Philo (certainly not to be confounded with the Alexandrian Platonist), who applied the name of Solomon to his work, as if from its ethical character it were written in his honour; and thus it may have found a place amongst the Christian writings in the Fragment.

If the book of Wisdom and its author are introduced only by way of comparison, still it seems far more probable that it was a recent work by a recent writer than something ancient and obscure; for comparisons are customarily made with familiar objects: but if not so introduced, then it seems as if something was intended which ranks at least in date with others that are mentioned. Eusebius, in speaking of Irenaeus, mentions this book *twice*. In the first place (H. E. v. 8), after speaking of the canonical writings of the New Testament used by that Father, he goes on to say that he quoted from the Shepherd of Hermas, καὶ ῥητοῖς δὲ τισιν ἐκ τῆς Σολομῶνος Σοφίας κέχρηται μονονουχί φάσκων ὅρασις δὲ θεοῦ περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας, “ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ.” These latter words are those which Irenaeus (C. H. iv. 38, § 4) cites μονονουχί, *almost expressly*, from Wisdom vi. 19. Eusebius goes on to say that he also cited an Apostolic presbyter, whom he does not name, and that he mentioned Justin Martyr and Ignatius, and also the doctrines of Marcion. He then informs us what Irenaeus had said about the LXX version. Thus the Wisdom of Solomon stands in Eusebius’s arrangement in a peculiar place: he brings it in after the New Testament books, and between the Shepherd of Hermas and the writings of Justin. In the other place (v. 26), in which he speaks of the writings of Irenaeus, he brings in *together* the Epistle to the Hebrews and *that called the Wisdom of Solomon*, as having been mentioned and cited by that Father. There must have been some cause which led Eusebius, or other earlier authors whom he may have followed, to speak of this book amongst Christian writings, much as it is introduced in the Muratorian Fragment. I believe that the writer spoke of the *authorship* of this book, and that Jerome followed him, so as to preserve the true reading of his original Greek, in mentioning the name of PHILO<sup>n</sup>.

Roman Catholic writers, such as Leo Allatius (Mai, Patr. Nov. Biblioth.

<sup>n</sup> These remarks on the passage in the Fragment, suggesting that *ab amicis* really disguises ὑπὸ Φίλωνος, appeared in the Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, No. IV. March 1855. Five years after this I found that this had been *anticipated* by Bishop Fitzgerald. In communicating it to me he says, “It is hardly worth noticing my having made that conjecture about *ab amicis* ὑπὸ Φίλωνος, unless you think

that its having occurred to different persons independently is any considerable confirmation for it. For my part I think it so certain in itself as not to require help.” He who seeks for *truth* must not be surprised or disappointed if he finds that his *discoveries* (however independent) have been made by others before him.

v. 3. p. 50), meet the statement of Jerome, that ancient authors ascribe the book of Wisdom to Philo Judaeus, simply by remarking that, if that had been the case, the Church, in receiving the book as canonical, would have classed it among the New Testament Scriptures. Some of them, therefore, in accepting Jerome's report (but rejecting the epithet *Judaeus*, as denoting him who is so well known by it), ascribe the book to some other Jew named Philo anterior to the birth of our Lord.

But I believe that we want more light to be thrown, if possible, on the history of the book of Wisdom, and on the possibility of tracing it as existing prior to the Christian era°. How little early writers knew of the origin of this book is shewn by the mistake of Augustine in the earlier part of his career as an author, when he attributed it to Jesus the son of Sirach.

The first trace that I know of the book of Wisdom is in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (c. iii.): ζῆλον ἁδίκων . . . δι' οὗ καὶ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον: compare Sap. ii. 24, φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. In this the writer of Wisdom may have used the words of Rom. v. 12. And (c. xxvii.), τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ, τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; see Sap. xii. 12, and a few words blended from xi. 22. Thus the book was used in the first century; but it is a subject for inquiry if there be any earlier trace of it.

° Even if this sentence in the Muratorian Fragment ought not to receive the correction which I have suggested, and if the opinion which I *formerly* advanced be considered the better, yet still I think that the statement of Jerome is connected *with this passage*; only in that case it would be misunderstood by him. If *ab amicis* be the true rendering of words (as I formerly suggested) from Prov. xxv. 1, then the Greek may have been καὶ ἡ σοφία Σολομῶνος ὑπὸ φίλων εἰς τὴν τιμὴν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένη, and this might have been misread or misunderstood by Jerome, so as to introduce the name of Philo. In that case the writer of the Fragment would have intended the Proverbs, or at least the latter portion of the book, while, however, Jerome would have understood him to speak of the Apocryphal book of Wisdom.

As on *this supposition* I should restore the Greek differently from Bunsen (who gives it καὶ ἡ σοφία ὑπὸ φίλων Σολομῶνος εἰς αὐτοῦ τιμὴν γέγραπται), I should not consider that the *writer* misunderstood Prov. xxx. 1, but that the trans-

lator had erred as to the connection of the words, as he has in other places.

Jerome's eye might easily so deceive him that he might mentally supply the termination to φίλων, changing it to φίλωνος, unconscious that he was adding to what was before him: this in early undivided writing is a mistake to which readers are easily obnoxious; or he might have introduced the name of Philo by mere error and want of apprehension; we have proof enough of his mistakes in transfusing Greek words or ideas into Latin: e. g. De Vir. Ill. c. 9: "Scripsit Apocalypsin *quam interpretatur* Justinus Martyr et Irenaeus;" where the words *quam interpretatur*, which have led some to think of *expositions* by those two Fathers, now lost, are nothing but an incorrect version or entire misapprehension of ὡς δηλοῖ in Eusebius. Bunsen followed others in pointing out (Analecta Ante-Nicaena, i. 126) how Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 22, did actually misunderstand what Eusebius, H. E. iv. 22, preserved of Hegesippus.

§ 14. 11<sup>a</sup> l. 9. *apocalypse etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt*

l. 9. *apocalypse* should of course be *apocalypses*.

The book called the Apocalypse of Peter is spoken of in a doubtful manner, so as to imply, in accordance with what had been said above, that the Apocalypse of John in contrast was received without doubt. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) speaks of that of Peter as a spurious book; ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καὶ τῶν Παύλου Πράξεων ἡ γραφή, ὃ τε λεγόμενος Ποιμὴν, καὶ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου: he thus ranks it with forged Acts and a fictitious vision: and Sozomen (vii. 19), while mentioning the variations in the customs of different churches and countries, states that then, in the fifth century, τὴν καλουμένην ἀποκάλυψιν Πέτρου ὡς νόθον παντελῶς πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων δοκιμασθεῖσαν ἐν τισιν ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Παλαιστίνης εἰσέτι νῦν ἅπαξ ἐκάστου ἔτους ἀναγινωσκομένην ἔγνωμεν, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ παρασκευῆς ἣν εὐλαβῶς ἄγαν ὁ λαὸς νηστεύει ἐπὶ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους.

Eusebius (H. E. iii. 3), in speaking of the writings bearing the name of the Apostle Peter, after mentioning his Epistles and his so-called Acts and Gospel, addῃ, τό τε λεγόμενον αὐτοῦ Κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Ἀποκάλυψιν, οὐδ' ὅλως ἐκ καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδόμενα, ὅτι μὴ τε ἀρχαίων μὴ τε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις. However, in another place (H. E. vi. 14), this statement is modified as to the Apocalypse of Peter alone, when speaking of the writings of Clement of Alexandria: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσειςι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποιήται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθόν' τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε Βαρνάβα, καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην Ἀποκάλυψιν.

In Clement, "Ex scriptis propheticiis eclogae," are some fragments quoted from the so-called Apocalypse of Peter; of which Routh says (i. 426), "Attamen nimis ludicra sunt brevia illa translata ex Petri Apocalypsi ad *Eclogas* Clementi Alex. attributas, quam ut vel minimam liber habeat venerationem." His judgment is certainly not too severe; and indeed of the Hypotypeses as a whole, as quoted by Eusebius, he says, "Si modo Clementis fuerint Hypotypeses illae quae multa saltem frivola atque absurda continebant." (i. 405.)

The passages are:—

ἡ γραφή φησι, "τὰ βρέφη τὰ ἐκτιθέντα τημελούχῳ παραδίδοσθαι ἀγγέλῳ, ὑφ' οὗ παιδεύεσθαι τε καὶ αὔξειν' καὶ ἔσονται, φησίν, ὡς οἱ ἐκατὸν ἑτῶν ἐνταῦθα πιστοί." διὸ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει φησί, "Καὶ ἀστραπὴ πυρὸς πηδῶσα ἀπὸ τῶν

βρεφῶν ἐκείνων καὶ πλήσσουσα τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν γυναικῶν” ἐπεὶ ὁ δίκαιος ὡς σπινθὴρ διὰ καλίας ἐκλάμπει καὶ κρινεῖ ἔθνη. Sap. iii. 7. (§ 41. Potter, p. 999.)

αὐτίκα ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει φησὶν, “Τὰ βρέφη ἐξαμβλωθέντα τῆς ἀμείνονος ἐσόμενα μοίρας· ταῦτα ἀγγέλω τημελούχῳ παραδίδοσθαι, ἵνα γνώσεως μεταλάβοντα τῆς ἀμείνονος τύχῃ μονῆς, παθόντα ἃ ἂν ἔπαθεν καὶ ἐν σώματι γενόμενα· τὰ δ’ ἕτερα μόνῃς τῆς σωτηρίας τεύξεται ὡς ἡδικημένα ἐλεηθέντα, καὶ μένει ἄνευ κολάσεως, τοῦτο γέρας λαβόντα.” (§ 48. p. 1000.)

From this quotation it seems as if the words cited in the first extract with ἡ γραφή φησιν are from the Apocalypse of Peter as well as what is taken from it expressly. Probably two fragments are here joined which did not belong together, and thus Pseudo-Peter seems to be cited to confirm himself.

“τὸ δὲ γάλα τῶν γυναικῶν ῥέον ἀπὸ τῶν μαστῶν καὶ πηγνύμενον,” φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει, “γεννήσει θηρία λεπτὰ σαρκοφάγα, καὶ ἀνατρέχοντα εἰς αὐτὰς κατεσθίει,” διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας γίνεσθαι τὰς κολάσεις διδάσκων. “ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν γενᾶσθαι αὐτάς,” φησιν, ὡς διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐπράθη (? ἐπειράσθη) ὁ λαός, καὶ διὰ τὴν εἰς χριστὸν ἀπιστίαν, ὥς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφεινῶν ἐδάκνοντο. (§ 49.)

Methodius appears to cite this book as inspired Scripture; ὅθεν δὴ καὶ τημελούχοις ἀγγέλοις, κὰν ἐκ μοιχείας ὦσι, τὰ ἀποτικτόμενα παραδίδοσθαι παρελήφμεν ἐν θεοπνεύστοις γράμμασιν. (Conv. ii. 6. 45. p. 75 Combefis, p. 16 Jahn<sup>p</sup>.)

Well may we approve the judgment of those of whom the writer of the Fragment speaks as to this Apocalypse, “quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt.” This book being put forth in the name of Peter, seems on that account, and that only, to have met with a reception which now seems surprising. Its name long remained in the lists of books belonging to or rejected from the New Testament: it thus has a place in the Stichometry in the Codex Claromontanus, where the list is closed with “REVELATIO PETRI CCLXX;” that is the number of στίχοι which it contained. As in the same list the Revelation of St. John has 1200, the spurious Apocalypse of Peter would be about two-ninths in quantity; and

<sup>p</sup> Hilgenfeld (Nov. Test. extra Can. recept. iv. 77) conjectures that a passage cited as from a prophet in Hippolytus De Christo et Antichristo, cap. 15, is from the Apocalypse of Peter: but of this there is no proof. The strange statements in the fragment of Hippolytus on Hades, Πρὸς Ἑλλήνας (Fabricius, i. 220–2; Lagarde, 68–73), are far more probably taken from this book. If the basis of this so-called Apocalypse was 1 Pet. iii. 19, and iv. 6, then the accounts of

John the Baptist preaching in Hades as our Lord's *forerunner* there, as on earth, would seem to be taken from it: Οὗτος προέφθασε καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾧ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἀναιρεθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου, πρόδρομος γενόμενος ἐκεῖ σημαίνειν μέλλον κακέισε κατελεύσεσθαι τὸν σωτῆρα λυτρούμενον τὰς ἀγίων ψυχὰς ἐκ χειρὸς θανάτου. Hippolytus de Christo et Antichristo, 45. (Fabricius, i. 22; Lagarde, 22.)

this is confirmed by the Stichometry of Nicephorus, in which, although the numbers in each case are rather higher, yet the proportions are about the same; Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου στίχοι αὐ'. Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου στίχοι τ' : i. e. 1400 and 300.

In the Codex Sinaiticus, between the Epistle of Pseudo-Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, which are subjoined to the canonical books, six leaves are gone; and Tischendorf conjectured that the Apocalypse of Peter had been once there as part of the Codex: but these leaves would have contained a great deal too much; for the Revelation of St. John in that MS. is comprised in about eight leaves and a half.

§ 15. II<sup>a</sup> l. 11.

*Pastorem uero  
nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe  
roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe  
tra urbis romae aeclesiae Pio episcopus fratre  
15 eius et ideo legi eum quidem oportet se pu  
blicare uero in eclesia populo neque inter  
profetas completum numero neque inter  
apostolos in finem temporum potest.*

l. 13. "Herma," read *Hermas*. Freindaller supplies "*in*" before *cathedra*: so also others. l. 14. "ēps," read *episcopo*; at first there was *episcopus frater*, but when the latter word was corrected into *fratre*, the final letter of the contraction *eps* was, it seems, inadvertently left unchanged. ll. 15, 16. "se puplicare," "*sed publicari uero*. Græce, ἀλλὰ δημοσιεύεσθαι δῆ." Routh: so Van Gilse, and Bunsen. Others keep the reading of the MS.; though Westcott and Hilgenfeld regard δημοσιεύεσθαι as the word of the original. l. 17. "*completum*;" *completos*, Routh, Van Gilse, Credner. *completo* Bunsen, Hilgenfeld. Volkmar makes no correction. Westcott says, "*Completo numero*. This appears to be corrupt, for the phrase can scarcely mean, 'a collection made up fully in number,' as if *Prophetas* were equivalent to *Corpus Prophetarum* (Volkmar)." *Prophetas completo numero* ought, I believe, to be read.

This passage is of particular importance as to the date of the authorship of the Fragment, and also as to the care taken not to admit into public use as sacred books those which were known to have no claim to be thus received. It seems to be introduced here, because the Shepherd of Hermas in its *form* claims to be a Divine vision; and thus it would be a kind of Apocalypse if accepted at all: we know that such a mistake was made; and this was probably the case before the author wrote the

Fragment; for he could hardly give his counter-testimony against a non-existent error.

The purport of the sentence is clear enough:—Now Hermas wrote the Shepherd very recently in our time in the city of Rome, while Pius his brother the bishop sat in the chair of the church of the city of Rome.—And thus it should be read. But to read it in the church publicly to the people, neither amongst the prophets, the number being complete, nor amongst the apostles, in respect of the limit of time, is admissible.

But the book was in circulation, and in many places in which the history of its authorship was not known, it was received, on the ground of its apparent claims, by those who were unconscious that the form of a vision was only the *drapery* used by the author.

Thus it was treated with most undeserved respect by some, both in the West and East. Irenaeus thus quotes from it as Scripture: (the Greek of the passage is preserved by Eusebius, H. E. v. 8;) *καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν ἡ γραφή ἡ λέγουσα, Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.* (Mand. i.)

In the same age the book had reached Alexandria, where Clement quoted it as if it were an authority in matters of *fact*: thus, *λέγει δὲ καὶ ὁ Ποιμὴν, ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας, τῷ Ἑρμῇ*, Strom. i. 17 (p. 369). See also Strom. i. 29 (p. 426); ii. 1 (p. 430); ii. 9 (p. 452); ii. 12, 13 (pp. 458, 9); iv. 9 (p. 596); vi. 6 (p. 764); vi. 15 (p. 806). Sometimes the writer is cited, sometimes the book, sometimes only the words.

Origen, too, gave his opinion of the book, which he ascribed to the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul; “Salutate Asyncretum, Phlegontem, Hermen, Patroban, Herman, et si qui cum eis sunt fratres. de istis simplex est salutatio, nec aliquid eis insigne laudis adjungitur. *Puto tamen quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur. quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata.*” Orig. Int. iv. 683. The connection of *utilis* with *divinitus inspirata* is clearly suggested by 2 Tim. iii. 16. Some of Origen’s predecessors may have shared in what he thus gives as his personal opinion, and thus they may have spoken of the book with reverence: but there is no authority prior to that of Origen for attributing the book to the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14; and he gives this as his own supposition merely. He thus cites it several times; De Princ. i. 3 (i. 61); ii. 1 (p. 79); iii. 2 (p. 140). In Ezek. (iii. 404); in Hos. (iii. 439); in Matt. (iii. 877); in Luc. (iii. 973); in Johan. (iv. 19); though occasionally with an intimation that it was not received by all; *διὰ τοῦτο ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τινων καταφρονουμένῳ βιβλίῳ τῷ ποιμένι, περὶ τοῦ προστάσσεσθαι τὸν Ἑρμῶν δύο γράψαι βιβλία κ.τ.λ.* De Princ. iv. 11 (i. 168). *ἀπὸ τινος φερομένης μὲν ἐν*

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γραφῆς, οὐ παρὰ πᾶσι δὲ ὁμολογουμένης εἶναι θέας κ.τ.λ. In Matt. tom. xiv. 21 (iii. 644<sup>d</sup>), see also ii. 294, “si cui tamen scriptura illa recipienda videtur;” and iii. 872.

But the claims of this book did not pass unchallenged: Tertullian, who had in an earlier work quoted it, but without giving any opinion, afterwards delivers a judgment going far beyond what was merely personal. “Cederem tibi si scriptura Pastoris quae sola moechos amat divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum etiam vestrarum apocrypha et falsa judicaretur, adultera et ipsa patrona sociorum.” (De Pudicitia 10.) Also, “Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae [i. e. ad Hebraeos canonica] illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum.” (De Pud. 20.) Eusebius, H. E. iii. 3, refers to the assertion that Hermas, Rom. xvi. 14, was the author; οὗ φασιν ὑπάρχειν τὸ τοῦ Ποιμένος βιβλίον, ἰστέον ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μέν τινων ἀντιλέλεκται. In iii. 25 he ranks it ἐν τοῖς νόθοις. He says nothing of his own as to the authorship; but v. 8 he notices how it had been received by Irenaeus, οὐ μόνον δὲ εἶδεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδέχεται τὴν τοῦ Ποιμένος γραφὴν, then giving the words cited above from Irenaeus.

Jerome, as in several other cases, expresses contradictory opinions as to this book, following apparently sometimes his own judgment, sometimes that of some authority before him. Thus he says, De Vir. Ill. c. 10, “Herman cujus Apostolus Paulus ad Romanos scribens meminit . . . asserunt auctorem esse libri, qui appellatur Pastor, et apud quasdam Graeciae ecclesias jam publice legitur. Revera utilis liber, multique de eo scriptorum veterum usurpavere testimonia, sed apud Latinos pene ignotus est.” In his Prologus Galeatus, before the books of Kings, he says, “Igitur Sapientia quae vulgo Salomonis inscribitur et Jesu filii Sirach liber et Judith et Tobias et Pastor non sunt in canone.” On Habakkuk i. 14 he thus contemptuously refers to it: “Ex quo liber ille apocryphus stultitiae condemnandus est, in quo scriptum est, quemdam angelum nomine Tyri praeesse reptilibus” (ed. Vallarsi, vi. 604). In the Decretum of Gelasius (A. D. 492–496) it is thus rejected: “§ 17. Liber, qui appellatur Pastoris apocryphus,” where the word means more than exclusion from all ecclesiastical use; it is a list of certain writings, “quae . . . a catholicis vitanda sunt.”

The testimony of Tertullian of this book having been condemned as apocryphal, “ab omni concilio ecclesiarum,” shews that in the second century a writing could not be put forth in a form claiming Divine revelation without the claims being subject to examination: and the historical ground on which such claims could be set aside is stated by the author of the Fragment.

As to the date and authorship of the Shepherd of Hermas, we have, on the one hand, the supposition of Origen, that it might be the production of one of that name mentioned by St. Paul, and thus it would belong to the first century; on the other we have, not the supposition, but the distinct statement of the author of the Fragment, that it was written by his contemporary, the brother of Pius, bishop of Rome in the second century: it seems strange with this alternative that any can still advocate the opinion which Origen expressed as his supposition merely<sup>a</sup>.

But the statement of the author of the Fragment is in full accordance with traditionary accounts; thus in the Liberian Catalogue of the bishops of Rome, or Liber Pontificalis, in the account of Pius I it is said, “sub hujus episcopatu frater ipsius Hermes librum scripsit in quo mandatum continetur, quod ei praecepit angelus Domini, cum veniret ad eum in habitu Pastoris, ut sanctum Pascha die dominica celebraretur.”

This reference appears plain: only we have no such passage now in the book<sup>r</sup>: it is referred to in a supposititious letter of this Pius, “nosse vos volumus, quod Pascha Domini die annuis solennitatibus sit celebrandum. istis ergo temporibus Hermes doctor fidei et scripturarum effulsit inter nos. et licet nos idem Pascha praedicta die celebremus, quia tamen quidam inde dubitarunt, ad corroborandas animas eorum eidem Hermæ angelus Domini in habitu Pastoris apparuit et praecepit ei, ut Pascha die dominica ab omnibus celebraretur.” This forged letter embodies the belief that Hermas was a contemporary of Pius (though it says nothing about his being his brother), and that *he* wrote the Shepherd, although of that pretended revelation we have not a word in our copies. “Presbyter Pastor titulum condidit et digne in Domino obiit,” is what Pius is made to say to Justus<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> It is quite irrelevant to set aside the testimony of the author of the Fragment because we are ignorant of his name. The remarkable document published by Waitz respecting Ulfilas (Ueber den Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila, Hannover, 1846) is equally anonymous, and yet it has supplied good evidence as to the life and date of that Gothic bishop. An anonymous historical document is not the less to be credited on that account. Routh (i. 429) says of the attempts of those who wish to refer Hermas to the first century: “Porro nonnulli apud Germaniam viri docti hunc scriptorem primo saeculo vindicandum, adhuc opinantur; utrum autem novis quibusvis rationibus sententiam suam confirmet, id nondum mihi videre

contigit.”

<sup>r</sup> “Non nisi spuria illa Pii epistola spuriusque liber Damasi pontificalis, in Pastore talia legi contendunt, prorsus de ea re silentibus antiquis Patribus; quo fit, ut posterioribus temporibus mandatum de Paschate die dominica celebrando, ab interpolatore quodam additum fuisse putemus.” Hefele, Patr. Apost. ed. 3. p. lxxxv.

<sup>s</sup> “Epistolas Pii ad Justum episc. quamvis non *plane* sunt indubitatae, ceteris tamen epistolis Pio adscriptis longe esse praeferendas inter doctos constat.” Hefele, p. lxxxii. And yet it seems as if Justus, to whom they are addressed, bishop of Vienne, lived in the *fourth* century.

The traditional belief as to the authorship is also stated in the poem of Pseudo-Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* (iii. sub finem):—

Constabat pietate vicens ecclesia Romae  
 Composita a Petro, ejus successor et ipse  
 Jamque loco nono cathedram suscepit Hyginus,  
 Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germine frater,  
 Angelicus pastor, quia tradita verba locutus,  
 Atque Pio suscepit Anicetus ordine sortem;  
 Sub quo Marcion his veniens nova Pontica pestis.

For “quia” in the fifth of these lines, Mosheim suggests “cui”—thus “cui tradita verba;” Routh, however, “*qui* tradita verba locutus.”

The popular traditions as to the relation of Pius and the author of the Shepherd seem combined in the Vatican Catalogue of the Popes, published by Cardinal Mai: “Pius primus, natione italicus, ex patre Rufino, fratre Pastoris, de civitate Aquileia . . . . Sub eo Hermes librum scripsit, in quo continetur mandatum quod ei praecepit angelus, ut sanctum pascha die dominica celebretur.” (*Spicilegium Romanum*, vi. 19.) Here “fratre” seems to be for *frater*; just as in this passage of the Fragment there was as first written precisely the converse mistake. The compiler seems to speak of Pastor and Hermes (as the name is written in the Pontifical lists) as different persons.

The opinions formed as to the theology of the Shepherd of Hermas are very varied, and in not a few respects his statements are very strange. As to the literary merit of the book, in style and conception, the opinions of late years have tended to give it a much higher place. In a letter written in the middle of 1851, Bunsen called “the Shepherd—that good but dull novel, which Niebuhr used to say he pitied the Athenian Christians for being obliged to hear in their meetings” (*Hippolytus*, vol. i. p. 315. ed. 1852). In reprinting these letters in 1854, Bunsen modified the expression into “that good but not very attractive novel” (*Hippolytus and his Age*, i. 471); while in the dissertation on Hermas (in the same vol. p. 182) he says, “‘The Shepherd’ is, indeed, one of those books which, like the ‘Divina Commedia’ and Bunyan’s ‘Pilgrim’s Progress,’ captivate the mind by the united power of thought and fiction, both drawn from the genuine depths of the human soul.” Without knowing this opinion of Bunsen, in 1855 Westcott published the following judgment (*Canon of the New Test.* ed. 1. p. 221, *foot-note*): “The beauty of language and conception in many parts of the ‘Shepherd’ seems to be greatly underrated. Much of it may

be compared with the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and higher praise than this cannot be given to such a book."

And yet the book was then only known, as it had been for many an age, through a barbarous Latin translation. Dressel's publication in 1857 of another version in Latin, found in the Palatine Codex, was in many passages a great improvement; and the recovery of the Greek text of the greater part, through the transcript made at Mount Athos by Simonides, now at Leipsic (edited by Anger and Dindorf in 1856), and the portion found by Tischendorf in the Codex Sinaiticus in 1859, enables us to form a pretty accurate judgment of the book itself; so that the beauty of language, &c. may now be more highly estimated than it could be when Bunsen and Westcott wrote. The re-discovery of long-lost writings has been remarkable in the present age. In the last twenty years there have been recovered about four of the orations of Hypereides, the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus<sup>t</sup>, the Greek text of the Pseudo-Barnabas and of *Hermas*,—to say nothing of what has been obtained from Syriac translations. May we not venture to express a hope that in an age in which so much has been brought to light, we may see the original Greek of the

<sup>t</sup> This work was brought by Minas, a Greek, from Mount Athos. Some time after it had passed into the Bibliothèque at Paris, it was transcribed by M. Emmanuel Miller (who saw that it was part of a work ascribed to Origen, whom he believed to be the author) for publication at Oxford.

I was occupied for some weeks in 1849 in collating Greek MSS. at Paris at a desk by the side of M. Miller, then engaged in making his transcript: he drew my attention to the MS., of which I read many parts, especially the history of Callistus, which is so remarkable. M. Miller thought that the account was that of his *martyrdom* (in the common acceptation of the word), and thus I suppose that for a couple of years I was alone aware of the historical statements there recorded relative to the flagitious deeds of that *Pope*.

In May 1851 I was at Oxford, when Dr. Macbride put into my hands the volume which had just appeared: I then read it through with far more ease than I could the MS. On May 24 I saw Dr. Routh, who had read the book, and seemed delighted to give his thoughts on it to one already acquainted with it. If it was

the work of Origen (he said), it shews two things; first, that his style and opinions must have greatly differed in different parts of his life; and secondly, that we must have been in ignorance of the real events of his life, so much of that of the author having been certainly passed in the West, and at or near Rome. Also, if this had been the work of Origen, it is strange that passages from it were never cited by those who impugned his theology, and still stranger that orthodox sentiments found in it were not alleged by his defenders. Thus he stated the difficulties in the way of supposing Origen to be the writer, besides the old one, that the part previously known is professedly the work of a bishop.

On June 10 in that year, Chevalier Bunsen asked me if anything new had come out at Oxford. I told him of this work (of which he had not before heard), and of Dr. Routh's points of inquiry, which might lead to the authorship being ascertained. I believe that Photius speaks not of this book, but of the former outline, which the author of this says he had written. (*Lib. i. sub init.*)

Muratorian Fragment itself confuting or confirming the varied criticisms on its text and contents.

We may thus conclude that the writer of the Fragment has given us a notification that he was a contemporary of Pius and his brother Hermas; the date of the episcopate of Pius is variously stated 127-142 and 142-157: there appear to be good reasons for the opinion of Pearson in inclining to an early rather than a later date. We may therefore judge that the author lived and was able to estimate the circumstances around him before the middle of the second century, when (as he says) Hermas wrote, “*nuperrime temporibus nostris.*” Some who rest especially on the last words seem to think that the Fragment might have been written at about the end of the second century by one who could speak of the things of fifty or sixty years before as being in his days. But could he then have said *nuperrime*? Many now may speak of Waterloo, the downfall of the French Empire, and the latter years of the reign of George III, as having been in their days; but they would not speak of any such things as *very recent*; we should hardly apply the term *now* (1867) to the Crimean war, even if we did so to the campaign of Magenta and Solferino, or the downfall of the kingdom of Naples in the following year. Thus I think that if *ten* years after the writing of the Shepherd be the date of the Fragment, it is far more probable than would be twenty years, or any longer period. Thus I believe the document to belong to about A.D. 160 or earlier.

§ 16. 11<sup>a</sup> l. 19. *Arsinoi autem seu ualentini . vel mitiadis  
nihil in totum recipemus. Qui etiam nouum  
psalmorum librum marcioni conscripse  
runt una cum basilide assianum catafry  
23 cum constitutorem*

These concluding lines of the Fragment (which thus breaks off abruptly) evidently refer to books of Heretics which were entirely rejected, and not used even as the Shepherd of Hermas might be. Westcott says of these lines, “The conclusion is hopelessly corrupt, and evidently was so in the copy from which the Fragment was derived.”

“*Arsinous* *SEU* *Valentinus* significare potest *Arsinous* qui et *Valentinus* dicitur.” Van Gilse. Simon de Magistris suggests the word “Arsinoi” to signify that Valentinus was of the Egyptian *nomos* of Arsinoe; he proposes Ἀρσενόιτου; Bunsen Ἀρσενοέως. Hilgenfeld conjectures that “Arsenoi” perhaps should be *Marcionis*. Credner (1847) conjectured *Bardesanis*; but in 1860 he regarded this as some Egyptian Gnostic then well known

by this designation. Volkmar supposes this *Arsenoite* to be the heretic Ptolemaeus. Routh proposes *Arsinoëtum* to include both of those who follow.

l. 19. "Mitiadis," *Miltiadis*. An anonymous writer *πρὸς τὴν λεγομένην κατὰ Φρύγας αἵρεσιν*, cited by Eusebius (H. E. v. 16), mentions *τὴν τῶν κατὰ Μιλτιάδην λεγομένην αἵρεσιν*: it need not be doubted that the same person is here intended. Contrary to all authority, some editors of Eusebius have changed *Μιλτιάδην* into *Ἀλκιβιάδην*, from a comparison with the names of the leading Montanists in chap. 3 of the same book: but how needless the change is, this passage of the Fragment shews.

l. 20. *recipimus*. "Qui etiam" should probably be *quinetiam*. "We do not receive anything whatever of Arsinous or Valentinus or Miltiades; moreover . . . have written a new book of Psalms: together with Basilides, . . . founder of the Cataphrygians." Such seems to be the general purport of this most obscurely corrupt passage; treating wholly of books not received at all. "Marcioni conscripserunt" may be *Marciani* (see Eus. H. E. vi. 12) *conscrips.*, or *Marcionistae conscrips.* Routh proposes "Marcionis." For the last obscure words Routh would read *Asianorum Cataphrygum constitutorem*; but these lines seem, like broken fragments, too ill-placed together, and too much injured, for any satisfactory restoration to be effected.

## PART IV.

The Relation of the Muratorian Canon to other Authorities  
of the Second Century.

§ I. IN the Muratorian Canon we have certain statements as to fact concerning books which in the middle of the second century were received or rejected. In ordinary cases the testimony of this writer would be deemed quite sufficient; but as every conceivable point has been made a matter of question and discussion, the relation of this Canon to other authorities in the second century becomes, if not a necessary subject for inquiry, a point of suitable investigation in connection with this document.

But in any such inquiry it is important to remember, that facts when once ascertained may be used as such, that it is not needful to re-state the evidence of every point over and over again, and that a writer need not be supposed to be ignorant of the surmise of an objector as to the spuriousness of a work of ascertained genuineness, because he does not fill his pages with proofs of what is certain. I mention this because of late there have been those who say that if a writer uses a patristic work of well-known genuineness without stating that any doubt had been expressed on the point, he may be charged with ignorance as to the "latest investigations" of some German critic; these latest investigations themselves being merely surmises, whose only merit lay in their novelty, and which cease to possess their sole supposed merit of being the "latest," when any one better or (it may be) worse informed puts forth some still newer theory. Therefore in books that I may quote, or writers to whom I may refer, I do not think it behoves me to repeat doubts, the groundlessness of which I have learned, or to treat with "respectful attention" opinions or paradoxes only remarkable for the novelty which they possessed when first brought forward<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Let me ask those who profess to pay such deference to the "latest investigations" of some German scholar, to attend to the remarks of Bunsen, when speaking of the (so-called) "Apostolic Constitutions." He says, "Modern

criticism has been left to the Germans, for whom *reality* has no charm." And again, "As to the research of the Protestant Critical School in Germany, the criticism upon these Constitutions is undoubtedly its weakest part,

One value possessed by the Muratorian Canon is, that it gives a definite groundwork around which the other witnesses of the second century, naturally as it were, arrange themselves. The scattered testimonies have in themselves a very great value: but this is found to be far more the case when it is known that the sacred books of the New Testament were received *as a collection*, and that this was the case in the middle of the second century as to the greater part of those which we accept. Most of those who try to involve the whole subject in doubt and difficulty, do so by taking the present time as that from which they look back, instead of taking their stand at the close of the second century,—a period of time at which *we know* that as to the four Gospels, and the other books of the New Testament in general, there was one definite opinion throughout the Church as to their authorship and divine authority. Standing, then, in the latter part of the second century, the Muratorian list is a canon already existing, containing by *name* twenty-three of our twenty-seven books; and while looking at the evidence of that age, we may as to several books trace the still earlier notices, which connect that period with the Apostolic age itself.

Those four books of the New Testament which are not mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment have on different grounds a claim to attention. As to these alone, the time of discussion is here made to extend beyond the end of the second century. (See Part V.)

§ 2. THE GOSPELS. Although the Muratorian Canon is mutilated at the beginning, it definitely recognizes *four* Gospels, of which the two later are those of St. Luke and St. John. It may be deemed equally certain that the first Gospel, of which the mention is entirely lost, was that of St. Matthew; and the second, about which we have the concluding words only, was that of St. Mark.

At the close of the second century, we have most explicit evidence as to what the four Gospels were, which were then generally received and used wherever the Christian name was known. IRENAEUS gives us a testimony which unites Asia Minor, the scene of his earlier life, and Southern Gaul, the sphere of his Christian service. CLEMENT of Alexandria combines the testimony of that city, to which Grecian learning had betaken itself as an emigrant, with Athens, which still remained the intellectual centre of

and very naturally so. What they know how to handle best is thought, the ideal part of history; what is farthest from their grasp is *reality*." (Hippolytus and his Age, vol. ii. pp.

228, 239. ed. 1852. In ed. 1854, ii. pp. 400, 407.)

Facts, not theories, have to be made the subjects of investigation.

Greece itself: while TERTULLIAN gives us the testimony of Carthage and the whole North-African Church. Thus these three witnesses not only set before us their individual testimony, but they present us with that which combines the Greek and Latin Christians—the united evidence of the East and West.

But it is needless to insist on this: for it stands as an admitted fact, that in the last quarter of the second century the reception and use of the four Gospels, and of these alone, was as unquestionable throughout the Church as it is now at the present time. Although, however, it is needless to *prove* points which cannot be denied, it is of some importance to shew *how* Irenaeus speaks of the acceptance and use of the *four* Gospels in such a way as to shew that this was a common notion or axiom amongst Christians. He says:—

“Neque autem plura numero quam haec sunt, neque rursus pauciora capit esse Evangelia<sup>b</sup>. Ἐπειδὴ τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ᾧ ἔσμεν εἰσί, καὶ τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, στῦλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς· εἰκότως τέσσαρας ἔχειν αὐτὴν στύλους, πανταχόθεν πνέοντας τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἀναζωπυροῦντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. ἐξ ὧν φανερόν, ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἀπάντων τεχνίτης Λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον. καθὼς ὁ Δαβὶδ αἰτούμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν, φησὶν, Ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ, ἐμφάνηθι. καὶ γὰρ τὰ χερουβίμ τετραπρόσωπα, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν, εἰκόνες τῆς πραγματείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ζῶν, φησὶν, ὅμοιον λέοντι, τὸ ἔμπρακτον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ βασιλικὸν χαρακτηρίζον· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ὅμοιον μόσχῳ, τὴν ἱερουργικὴν καὶ ἱερατικὴν τάξιν ἐμφαίνον· τὸ δὲ τρίτον ἔχον πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου, τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν φανερώτατα διαγράφον. τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὅμοιον ἀετῷ πετωμένῳ, τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐφιπταμένου δόσιν σαφηνίζον. καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια οὖν τούτοις σύμφωνα, ἐν οἷς ἐγκαθίσταται χριστός. τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ Ἰωάννην, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔνδοξον γενεὰν διηγείται, λέγων, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, et verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum: καὶ Πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν· Propter hoc et omni fiducia plenum est evangelium istud; talis est enim persona ejus. Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἅτε ἱερατικοῦ χαρακτήρος ὑπάρχον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἱερέως θυμῶντος τῷ θεῷ ἤρξατο. ἤδη γὰρ ὁ σιτευτὸς ἡτοιμάζετο μόσχος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνευρέσεως τοῦ νεωτέρου παιδὸς μέλλων θύεσθαι. Ματθαῖος δὲ τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ γέννησιν κηρύττει λέγων, Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ

<sup>b</sup> The introductory words are simply preserved in the old Latin version; the Greek of the greater part of what follows is found in

early citations: the Latin at times is quoted, as being all that has been transmitted.

Δαβίδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. καί, τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ (om. Lat.<sup>c</sup>) χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν. ἀνθρωπόμορφον οὖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο· propter hoc et per totum evangelium humiliter sentiens et mitis homo servatus est. Μάρκος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιόντος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποίησατο λέγων, Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ· τὴν πτερωτικὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου δεικνύων· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ σύντομον καὶ παρατρέχουσιν τὴν καταγγελίαν πεποίηται· προφητικὸς γὰρ ὁ χαρακτήρ οὗτος. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς μὲν πρὸ Μωυσέως πατριάρχαις, κατὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν καὶ ἔνδοξον ὠμίλει· τοῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἱερατικὴν τάξιν ἀπένειμεν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς πᾶσαν ἐξέπεμψε τὴν γῆν, σκεπάζων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πτέρυξιν. ὅποια οὖν ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοιαύτη καὶ τῶν ζώων ἡ μορφή· καὶ ὅποια ἡ τῶν ζώων μορφή, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ χαρακτήρ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. τετράμορφα γὰρ τὰ ζῶα, τετράμορφον καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ἡ πραγματεία τοῦ κυρίου. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τέσσαρες ἐδόθησαν καθολικαὶ διαθήκαι τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι· μία μὲν τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τοῦ Νῶε ἐπὶ τοῦ τόξου, δευτέρα δὲ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐπὶ τοῦ σημείου τῆς περιτομῆς, τρίτη δὲ ἡ νομοθεσία ἐπὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως, τετάρτη δὲ ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ<sup>d</sup>.

τούτων δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων, μάταιοι πάντες καὶ ἀμαθεῖς προσέτι δὲ καὶ τολμηροὶ οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἰδέαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ εἴτε πλείονα εἴτε ἐλάττονα τῶν εἰρημένων παρεισφύροντες εὐαγγελίων πρόσωπα· οἱ μὲν ἵνα πλείονα δόξωσι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξευρηκέναι· οἱ δὲ ἵνα τὰς οἰκονομίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἀθετήσωσιν. (C. H. iii. 11. §§ 8, 9.)

This long citation from Irenaeus is given, not to prove the certain fact of the common reception in the last quarter of the second century of *our* four Gospels, but rather to shew *how* this was done, and what Irenaeus regarded (however fanciful were the illustrations which he used) as *the idea of the Gospel*; a statement which he could not have advanced if it had been a singular opinion of his own.

<sup>c</sup> So too Irenaeus elsewhere *expressly* omits Ἰησοῦ in this passage. "Christi autem generatio sic erat . . . . Ceterum potuerat dicere Matthaeus, *Jesu vero generatio sic erat*; sed praevidens Spiritus sanctus depravatores, et prae-muniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthaeum ait, Christi autem generatio sic erat." (C. H. iii. 16. 2.) The reading χριστοῦ without Ἰησοῦ is, in conformity with the statement of Irenaeus, attested in the West by the old Latin and Vulgate, in the East by the Syriac version found amongst the Nitrian MSS., and published by the late Dr. Cureton. Although this reading is not now found in any Greek MS., yet that it was once the reading of the Greek

of Codex Bezae (D), of which the first leaf is lost, is shewn by the Latin which in that MS. is still extant, preserving the ancient reading so expressly maintained by Irenaeus as that of the second century.

<sup>d</sup> The Latin of this clause differs considerably—"Et propter hoc quatuor data sunt testamenta humano generi; unum quidem ante cataclysmum sub Adam; secundum vero post cataclysmum sub Noë; tertium vero legislatio sub Moyse; quartum vero quod renovat hominem et recapitulat in se omnia, quod est per Evangelium, elevans et pennigerans homines in caeleste regnum."

Could then this common reception of our four canonical Gospels have been a thing suddenly adopted by the Church at large? Is it possible that the Gospel of St. John (for instance) could have been a work recently composed by some one who wrote as personating the Apostle, and yet that the Churches everywhere (of whom Tertullian, Clement, and Irenaeus are sufficient representatives) supposed the Gospel to be genuine, and without concert used it as such?

It may be noticed that Irenaeus *habitually* calls John, the author of the fourth Gospel, a *disciple*; though identifying him most definitely with the Apostle of that name: in doing this he only carries out John's own phraseology. Those who received that Gospel, accepted it as the testimony of an eye-witness; if a genuine writing, there is no alternative. The personal relation to the Lord of μαθητής, one *taught* by Him, for certain purposes expresses more than the official dignity of ἀπόστολος, one sent forth by Him.

But besides the Muratorian Canon, we may go back yet farther than the closing years of the second century. Before the middle of that age, and within fifty years of the death of St. John, we know from the testimony of Justin Martyr<sup>e</sup> what was and *had been* the practice of the Christian Churches. Justin tells us in his First Apology, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and his colleagues, what the weekly worship of the Christians was: "On the day called Sunday there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell in the cities or in the country, and *the memorials of the Apostles* or the writings of the Prophets are read as time may permit." (Apol. i. § 67.) That there should be no doubt as to what is intended by the expression "*memorials of the Apostles*," he had just before explained it; informing the Emperors that the institution of the Lord's Supper had been recorded by the Apostles in their memorials, *which are called Gospels*: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου· τουτέστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτο ἐστὶ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι. (Apol. i. § 66.)

<sup>e</sup> The Chronology of the Life, &c. of Justin Martyr makes no real difference in the argument; but I quite believe that the conclusions expressed by the Rev. F. J. A. Hort (Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, iii. 139) are perfectly correct: "We may, without fear of considerable error, set down Justin's First Apo-

logy to 145, or, better still, to 146, and his death to 148. The Second Apology, if really separate from the First, will then fall in 146 or 147, and the Dialogue with Tryphon about the same time." I may here say that I can by no means suppose the Second Apology to be anything but the conclusion of the First.

In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Justin gives a yet further account of the authorship of these memorials; he describes them as written by the Apostles of Christ and their followers or companions: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, ὅτι ἰδρῶς ὥσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος, Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τούτο. (§ 103.) There was an especial fitness on Justin's part in thus precisely mentioning the authorship of the Gospels, when about to quote from one not actually written by an Apostle. The number of Gospels is nowhere mentioned by Justin; but when he speaks of their authors having been Apostles and those who were their companions, he intimates that they were at least four; no smaller number could be implied by the two groups. παρακολουθησάντων reminds us of παρηκολουθηκότι, Luke i. 3.

Now when Justin, in his solemn appeal to the Emperors, speaks of what the Christians universally did then and had done in their weekly assemblies, his words have a force of testimony far beyond anything which has to do with him as an individual witness; he refers to a public custom, a general practice; and thus the Christians at large are united with him as bearing evidence to the fact, which was nothing personal or peculiar.

Were then the Gospels in the days of Justin the same which were in general use in the time of Irenaeus? If they were not, then it would follow that between the middle and the last quarter of the second century the Churches everywhere had changed the Gospels which they were

<sup>f</sup> To see the full force of Justin's testimony, it is needful to consider the whole passage: he is speaking of what Christians had done from the time when Christ instituted the Lord's Supper: ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν αἰεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμνησκόμεν· καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τοῖς λειπομένοις πᾶσιν ἐπικουροῦμεν, καὶ σύνεσμεν ἀλλήλοις αἰεὶ. ἐπὶ πᾶσι τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα, εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου· καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ· εἴτα πανσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προσεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νοουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· καί, ὡς προέφημεν [§ 66], πανσαμένου ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προσεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαρι-

στίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐευφημεῖ τὸ ἄμην· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται, οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὁ βούλεται δίδωσιν· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ προσεστῷ ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοὺς τε καὶ χήρας καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἀπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπεὶ δὲ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεῖς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς, ἐδίδασκε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ἡμῖν ἀνεδώκαμεν. (Ap. i. 67.)

accustomed to employ; that they had done this in all places in the same manner, and yet that not a trace can be found of this having been noticed and remarked on, whether by friend or foe. But this is not all the difficulty involved in the supposition; for we have to add to this that they must have received the new Gospels (or Gospel, if only one was changed) with all reverence, and have believed that from the first they had possessed and used the same. Such are a few of the impossibilities which those have to encounter, who deny our four Gospels to be the same that were in use before the middle of the second century; that is, immediately after the Apostolic age, and in the lifetime of the tens of thousands of Christians who had been contemporaries with the Apostles, and who *must* have known what their writings really were. Also on any such supposition, the testimony of the Muratorian Fragment must be set aside; for the writer goes back to the age of Justin.

If proof be wanted that the Gospels used in the age of Justin were *four*, it is to be found in the fact that his disciple Tatian called his combined history from the Gospels τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων, a plain indication that four Gospels were then in use. And if four, then, as we see from Irenaeus, *our* four.

But it has been objected that the Gospels which Justin himself used and quoted were not ours, but only certain apocryphal documents: if so, they must in their contents and words have most remarkably resembled ours; they must have been capable of being similarly described; and the difficulties to which allusion has been made would remain in full force. Sentence after sentence would be found in which Justin cites the sense at least of our Gospels, so that the difficulty of investigating such an hypothesis would present itself at every step. "But (it is said) Justin quotes from his Gospels *two things* which are not found in ours:" this is true; but he cites the Old Testament much in the same way, referring to the Pentateuch for *two* facts which it does not contain. Will any objector say that *his* Pentateuch was not the same as ours? Those things which Justin cites from the Gospels which we do not find there, are substantially contained in some copies, and they would be at all events a very small traditional accretion §.

§ Those who have of late revived the theory that Justin used some of the profane legends called Apocryphal Gospels, would do well to inquire how it is that he has so little in common with such writings.

From the introduction to St. Luke's Gospel

we know that many even then had taken in hand to write narratives of our Lord's life; but it is impossible to suppose that *any* of the Apocryphal Gospels now extant can belong to that age.

It seems now to be pretty generally owned that Justin (and the Church therefore in Justin's day) used our first three Gospels; but (it is said) "Justin never mentions St. John's Gospel;" neither does he mention the *writers* of the other Gospels by name. The first who *cites* the fourth Gospel with the *name* of St. John, was Justin's younger contemporary, Theophilus of Antioch, who introduces the words with which St. John begins his Gospel. But when Justin says—ὁ χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι φανερόν πασίν ἐστι (Ap. i. § 61),—it is difficult to suppose that our Lord's words, and the objection of Nicodemus in John iii., were not in his mind. And so too when he says that Christ was the Son and Word of God, who became incarnate as man—καὶ υἱὸς καὶ λόγος ἐστίν, ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν (Ap. i. § 32), can it be reasonably doubted that he referred to John i. 14?

But if it were denied that Justin had and used our fourth Gospel, the difficulties already mentioned would remain unexplained; and also some solution would need to be given of the fact that St. John's Gospel is distinctly quoted (though without the name of the author) by his disciple Tatian. All these difficulties are solved, all these improbabilities are removed, when once the fact is admitted that the Gospels used in the days of Irenaeus were those employed in the time of Justin, according to what we learn from the Muratorian Fragment; which indeed we might apprehend as a necessary deduction.

But as the Muratorian Fragment is defective at the beginning, it is satisfactory that in the fragments of Papias preserved by Eusebius we have his account of the two first Gospels, such as he received from John the Presbyter, one of the immediate disciples of our Lord, still living at the close of the first century or beginning of the second. (Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39.)

καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε, Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν· οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων. ὥστε οὐδὲν ἤμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστόρηται τῷ Παπῇ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτα εἶρηται· Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.

Irenaeus, too, who is a witness of the general use of our Gospels in the latter part of the second century, shews that he was acquainted with

their history and their authorship as known facts: he says, "Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus quam per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum . . . Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. καὶ Λουκᾶς δέ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσὼν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων." (C. H. iii. 1. 1.)

In this connection let the relation of Irenaeus to the Apostolic age and to those who then lived be remembered. He says, in addressing Florinus, who had introduced erroneous doctrines:—

"Thou never didst receive these doctrines from the Elders who preceded us, who themselves had associated with the Apostles. When I was yet a boy, I saw thee in company with Polycarp in Asia Minor; . . . for I remember what took place then better than what happens now. What we heard in childhood grows along with the soul, and becomes one with it; so that I can describe the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and spoke, his going out and in, his manner of life, and the aspect of his person; the discourses which he delivered to the congregation; how he told of his intercourse with John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord; how he reported their sayings, and what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, and His miracles, and His doctrines. All these things were told by Polycarp in accordance with the Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Word of Life. Through the mercy of God given me even then, did I listen to these things with eagerness; and I wrote them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God, I constantly revive them again fresh before my memory. And I can witness before God that if the blessed and apostolic Presbyter had heard such things, he would have cried out, stopped his ears, and (according to his custom) have said, 'O good God, upon what times hast Thou brought me, that I must endure this!' And he would have fled away from the place where, seated or standing, he had heard such discourses." (Eusebius, H. E. v. 20.)

Thus Irenaeus is not only a competent witness to the common reception and use of our four Gospels, but from his connection with those of a former age, he is a good historian as to their authorship and origin.

When, then, he says that the first Gospel was written by Matthew *the Apostle* (C. H. iii. c. 9. § 1), we may be very confident that he knew of what he was speaking; and this answers the strange theories which attributed our first Gospel to some other Matthew, who (it was said) was in the latter part of the first century mistaken for the Apostle of the same name. This is a theory so peculiar, that it ought to be supported by the most definite evidence, instead of its resting upon none. Indeed, it cannot be thought that such a notion<sup>b</sup> would ever have been propounded, had there not been the desire of rejecting the belief of apostolical authorship. We know from Justin that the Gospels which the Christians used in their public assemblies had been written by at least two Apostles; for he uses the word in the plural: and even if Irenæus and others had not named Matthew *the Apostle*, we might have been sure that no other Matthew was meant.

As to our second Gospel, the authorship of which is not mentioned in the defective beginning of the Muratorian Canon, the only question is, whether the Mark to whom it is ascribed was the same person as "John whose surname was Mark," the cousin (or nephew) of Barnabas, the son of Mary, at whose house many of the Church were assembled for prayer on the night of Peter's miraculous deliverance from prison, and who for a time had been the companion of Paul in his labours. There is no question here of apostolic authorship, although ancient writers, on good and sufficient grounds, considered that St. Peter was the informant of Mark; so that in a sense this Gospel was spoken of as that of St. Peter. The writer of the second Gospel is thus identified with the Marcus of 1 Pet. v. 13; and a comparison with Acts xii. 12 makes it at least probable that the same person is spoken of there.

Now there was an early legend (for really it is nothing more in its existing *form*) which seems to shew still earlier identification of the Evangelist with the companion of Paul who departed from the work and returned to Jerusalem. This legend is embodied in a preface formerly ascribed to St. Jerome, and contained in the Codex Amiatinus of the sixth century. It says of Mark the Evangelist, "*Denique amputasse sibi post*

<sup>b</sup> If this theory is peculiar, it is as strange that it should have been supported by the passage from the Muratorian Fragment in which John is spoken of as an eye and ear witness; in contrast, it was said, to the three former Evangelists, and it was added, "*quum etiam Papias auctorem apostolum esse taceat.*" (Bun-

sen, Anal. Ante-Nic. i. 129.) The whole passage from Papias shews that the Matthew whom he spoke of as the author of a Gospel was the Apostle of that name: for he says that he had inquired, *τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ Θωμᾶς, ἢ Ἰάκωβος, ἢ τί Ἰωάννης, ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν.*

*fidem pollicem* dicitur, ut sacerdotio reprobis haberetur, sed tantum consentiens fidei praeordinata potuit electio, ut nec sic in opere verbi perderet quod prius meruerat in genere." To what can this strange statement refer? I have been accustomed to regard it as having originated from what is mentioned in Acts xiii. 13, "John, departing from them, returned to Jerusalem:" an occurrence the significance of which is shewn in chap. xv. 37, 38: "Barnabas determined to take with them John whose surname was Mark; but Paul thought not good to take him with them, who *departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not to the work.*" In this, then, St. Mark seemed to act as a deserter, or as one who by self-inflicted injury had rendered his hand unfit for military service ("ut sacerdotio reprobis haberetur"). Being thus figuratively *pollice truncus*, the notion of this as a *physical fact* arose, probably about the time when any such bodily imperfection was first thought to be a canonical ground for exclusion (except in extraordinary circumstances) from all ecclesiastical offices.

It is, I think, obvious that a metaphor has been misconceived, as though it implied a literal fact: several historical errors seem to have thus arisen: the story that Xerxes scourged the Hellespont<sup>i</sup>, and cast fetters into its waves, will occur to many as having sprung from giving a literal and concrete form to figurative expressions.

The rest of the account of St. Mark in the Latin preface,—“sed tantum consentiens fidei praeordinata potuit electio, ut nec sic in opere verbi perderet quod prius meruerat in genere,”—may have sprung from the subsequent testimony of St. Paul, “Take Mark, and bring him with thee; for *he is profitable to me for the ministry.*” 2 Tim. iv. 11.

<sup>i</sup> “The Greeks in the bridging of the *Sacred Hellespont* saw the beginning of a long career of audacious impiety, and gradually transformed the fastenings with which the passage was finally secured, into fetters and scourges, with which the barbarian in his madness had thought to chastise the aggression of the rebellious stream.” (Bishop Thirlwall, *History of Greece*, ii. 281.) “The origin of the story is sufficiently explained, as the commentators on Aeschylus and Herodotus have remarked, by the lines of the poet, Pers. 745,—

ὅστις Ἑλλήσποντον ἱερόν, δοῦλον ὧς, δεσμώμασιν  
ἤλπισε σχήσειν, ῥέοντα Βόσπορον ῥόνον θεοῦ.”

*Ibid.* foot-note.

Line 722, μηχαναῖς ἔξενξεν Ἑλλης πορθμόν, ὥστ'  
ἔχειν πόρον

and that which follows those quoted by

Bishop Thirlwall,—

747, καὶ πόρον μετερρύθμιξε, καὶ πέδαις σφύρη-  
λάτοις  
περιβαλὼν.

may seem especially to meet the very *terms* used by Herodotus, and they may have misled his informant; who, having witnessed the performance of the Persae, may have carried away these impressions on his *ear*. May not the story have grown *in part* from some of the more illiterate having connected σφῦρηλάτοις with σφῦρόν? Hence may have been suggested what Herodotus expresses by πεδέων ζεύγος. The *caution* of Herodotus is *amusing*: he could not believe *all* that he had been told: branding the water with hot irons was beyond his power of belief; not so the story formed from poetic epithets having been *literalized*.

Thus from the Latin preface alone certain conclusions may be formed, by which the narrative (or legend) can be simply explained without supposing that Mark inflicted on himself a bodily injury with the intent of thereby excluding himself from an office, for which the loss of a finger would not then have been any disqualification. Of course when this Preface was written the figurative expressions had been assumed as facts: but the account on which the metaphors were founded *must* be much older; and a proof of this in the former part of the third century we find in the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus, vii. 30 (p. 252 Miller, p. 392 Duncker and Schneidewin), who collocates together οὔτε Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος οὔτε Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος, where there seems a contrast in the epithets; neither Paul the pre-eminent Apostle, nor Mark whose shrinking conduct procured him such a designation as *pollice truncus*: thus looking, as it might be said, at the extremes of those who had written for the teaching of the Church.

In considering the authorship of the second Gospel, we have the writer brought before us all the more definitely, when we can thus identify this Mark the companion of Peter with “John whose surname was Mark” of so much earlier a period of the Apostolic ministry.

What could have induced the Church at large in the last quarter of the second century to have received and used publicly everywhere our four Gospels, ascribing two of them to Apostolic authorship? What could cause the same reception of the same writings before the middle of the second century, except that the Churches knew the origin, authorship, and full authority of the books?

Those who would have to prove a later origin of any of these books, have not only to bring forward some evidence for their opinions, but also to shew *how* the Catholic Church *could* have been mistaken as to facts lying fully within the sphere of its own knowledge. We are brought back to the circulation of the written Gospels, thus described by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 37) when speaking of a time within twenty years after the death of St. John: καὶ γὰρ δὴ πλείστοι τῶν τότε μαθητῶν σφοδροτέρῳ φιλοσοφίας ἔρωτι πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὴν ψυχὴν πληττόμενοι, τὴν σωτήριον πρότερον ἀπεπλήρουν παρακέλευσιν, ἐνδέεσι νέμοντες τὰς οὐσίας· ἔπειτα δὲ ἀποδημίας στελλόμενοι ἔργον ἐπετέλουν εὐαγγελιστῶν, τοῖς ἔτι πάμπαν ἀνηκόοις τοῦ τῆς πίστεως λόγου κηρύττειν τὸν χριστὸν φιλοτιμούμενοι, καὶ τὴν τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων παραδίδοναι γραφὴν.

Thus, then, throughout the second century, the testimony of the Catholic Church to the use and authority of our four Gospels, the first and fourth of them written by Apostles, is so clear and explicit, that those

only can raise questions on the subject who are determined to set evidence altogether aside.

But besides the testimony of the Catholic Church, we have that of writers of the Gnostic sects; which, although fragmentary, might, from its independence, be felt convincing by those who slight the evidence of the orthodox Christians<sup>k</sup>.

Now the Valentinians, the most widely spread probably of the speculatists of the second century, not only used phraseology borrowed from the beginning of St. John's Gospel, but they even used the words of the Apostle as a basis for their erroneous interpretations and vain speculations. An instance of this may be given, which is definitely quoted from "John the disciple of the Lord:"—

Ἐπεὶ οὖν περὶ πρώτης γενέσεως λέγει, καλῶς ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχῆς τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ [1. υἱοῦ, Lat. *a filio*] καὶ τοῦ Λόγου τὴν διδασκαλίαν ποιεῖται. λέγει δὲ οὕτως, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος· οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· πρότερον διαστείλας τὰ τρία, θεὸν καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ λόγον, πάλιν αὐτὰ ἐνοῖ, ἵνα καὶ τὴν προβολὴν ἐκατέρων αὐτῶν δείξῃ, τοῦ τε υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἅμα καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἔνωσιν. ἐν γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχή, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ λόγος· καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἦν γὰρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν· καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρχή· καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἀκολουθῶς. τὸ γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθὲν θεὸς ἐστίν. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· ἔδειξε τὴν τῆς προβολῆς τάξιν· πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδ' ἓν· πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν Αἰῶσι μορφῆς καὶ γενέσεως αἴτιος ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο. ἀλλὰ ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ, φησὶν, ζῶν ἐστίν· ἐνθάδε καὶ συζυγίαν ἐμήνυσεν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὅλα, ἔφη, δι' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, τὴν δὲ ζῶν ἐν αὐτῷ κ. τ. λ. (Irenaeus, C. H. i. 8. § 5.)

Ptolemaeus, in some respects a disciple of Valentinus, says:—ἐτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι τὰ τε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδέν. ὁ ἀπόστολος προαποστερήσας τὴν τῶν ψευδηγορούντων ἀνυπόστατον σοφίαν, καὶ οὐ φθοροποιῶν θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικαίου καὶ μισοπονήρου. (Epistola ad Floram, Epiph. Haer. 33. § 3. i. p. 217<sup>a</sup> Pet., ii. 199 Dind.)

The use of the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John at least, by the Valentinian Heracleon, is certain from the existing fragments of his Commen-

<sup>k</sup> As to heretical testimony, I only indicate a few points, instead of giving the details; on this subject I may here refer to chap. iv. (pp. 237—283, ed. 2) of Westcott's "General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament." On other points he gives details which would here be out of place. As to the passages from early writers, whether patristic,

heretical, or heathen, which have been commonly cited on the subject of the Canon, Kirchofer's "Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus," 1842-3, is remarkably useful for the purposes intended by the editor: I say this, although I have throughout resorted to the original authorities.

taries on those books. The only conclusion at which we can arrive is, that in widely-spread heresies of the second century the authority of our four Gospels was as fully held, and their authorship known, as in the Catholic Church itself.

But we can go back still earlier than Valentinus; for Basileides, who lived shortly after the time of the Apostles, expressly quotes St. John's Gospel:—Γέγονε, φησίν, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ λόγος ὁ λεχθείς, γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ τοῦτο, φησίν, ἔστι τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις, Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. (Hippolytus, *Philosophumena*, vii. 22. p. 232 Miller, p. 360 Duncker.)

As to St. Luke's Gospel, the manner in which it was altered by Marcion is a remarkable proof how it was used and known in the earlier part of the second century.

How, then, could it be that the Gospels which the Church at large used, were equally received by the heretical bodies? and that from the very times of the Apostles? The only answer is simple and obvious:—because their authorship was known and their authority fully admitted *before* such heretical sects had existed. Just as in the case of Tatian, whose Diatessaron must have been formed from the *four* Gospels (whose number was preserved in the name), which he had received and owned when belonging, equally with his instructor Justin Martyr, to the Catholic Church, which he afterwards left.

Thus Irenaeus most truly says:—"Tanta est autem circa evangelia haec firmitas, ut et ipsi haeretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam." (C. H. iii. 11. § 7.) And this passage occurs in what introduces his remarks (see above, p. 68) that the Gospels can be neither fewer nor more than *four*.

But in the second century we are not restricted to the evidence of those who, rightly or wrongly, bore the Christian name. Celsus, the heathen who wrote against the Christians, knew and referred to the Gospels which they used as *τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γραφεῖσιν*, "the writings of the disciples of Jesus" (Orig. c. Cels. ii. 13); and he referred to their contents in such a way, and so based his objections upon them, that even in the extracts preserved in the answer of Origen, we can see that he is a witness to our four Gospels as used by the Church.

Thus he speaks of them as containing genealogies of Jesus from the first man framed, and from the Jewish kings (c. Cels. ii. 32), in evident reference to Luke iii. and Matt. i. He alludes to the history in Matt. ii. (i. 58, 66), to Mark vi. 3 (vi. 36), for there alone our Lord is called a *carpenter*

(where Origen's copy of that Gospel had an incorrect reading); he says that *some* said that *one* angel appeared at the sepulchre, *some* mentioned *two* (ὕπό τινων μὲν ἄγγελοι δύο, ὑπό τινων δὲ εἷς, v. 52), thus shewing an acquaintance with the narratives of Matthew and Mark which speak of *one* angel, and those of Luke and John which have *two*. John xix. 34 is distinctly referred to (ii. 36). And when he says (as quoted by Origen), μετὰ ταῦτα Χριστιανοῖς ἐγκαλεῖ, ὡς σοφίζομένοις ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι αὐτολόγον· καὶ οἶεταί γε κρατύνειν τὸ ἔγκλημα· ἐπεὶ λόγον ἐπαγγελλόμενοι υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀποδείκνυμεν οὐ λόγον καθαρὸν καὶ ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἀτιμότατον ἀπαχθέντα ἀποτυμπανισθέντα (ii. 31), who can doubt that this opponent of Christian truth had John i. in his mind?

Thus fully does the heathen testimony accord with that of the heretics and of the Church in the second century as to the sacred narratives of the New Testament, which Celsus even calls *the Gospel*, which he charges the Christians with having altered again and again (referring apparently to the number): μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τριχῇ καὶ τετραχῇ καὶ πολλαχῇ, καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν πρὸς τοῖς ἐλέγχοις ἀρνεῖσθαι. (ii. 27.)

In speaking of the heretical testimony, especial prominence has been given to that which bears on the Gospel of St. John, simply because that Gospel has been of late years controverted very particularly; as if it had only been known by the Church or by others at the conclusion of the second century, instead of its being in constant use throughout that age, and well known as to its authorship and claims both by friends and foes. To assail that Gospel now, is to ignore the evidence which is so plain: if this be done in want of apprehension, it shews how little can those be trusted who seek in such things to mislead others. We trace that Gospel as to its historical use in the Church, back to the age of St. John's own contemporaries; we find it equally known to heretics and heathens: if this evidence be not sufficient, we might well ask, What would be accepted?

It is, however, in vain to overlook the fact that the fourth Gospel is distasteful on account of the doctrines which it sets forth with such plainness: the testimony of John the Baptist to our Lord is that to which the real objection is made, "Behold the Lamb of God! which taketh away the sin of the world."

But if we do not claim intuitive and unerring knowledge as to things spiritual, it is for us to make Scripture the rule of our faith, and not some subjective feeling of our own the test of what we ought to receive as Scripture.

Whoever casts doubt on this Gospel, seeks to render uncertain *now* that on which there was no doubt in the second century, and that on the

part of those who had all the facts before them. One testimony such as that of the Muratorian Fragment shews the futility of all the surmises that could be brought together.

I do not here make any remarks on the results which flow from the known and proved authorship of our four Gospels, farther than to say that their reception by those who must have known the facts, is the most ample attestation in itself of the truth of the record,—for which divine authority was claimed, and the claim was admitted by those who fully believed in the testimony of those who wrote as witnesses, especially of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.

§ 3. ST. JOHN'S FIRST EPISTLE. When Irenaeus uses and quotes this Epistle in the latter part of the second century, he does so in full accordance with the custom of his contemporaries, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Eusebius informs us (H. E. v. 8), that he mentions the first Epistle of John, bringing forward from it many testimonies; in his extant writings we find it cited three times (C. H. iii. 16, § 5, and § 8 *twice*); the authorship being expressly ascribed to John, the writer of the Gospel. “Propter quod et in epistola sua, sic testificatus est nobis [‘Joannes Domini discipulus’ (Joh. xx. 31 being cited)] ‘Filioli, novissima hora est, et quemadmodum audistis quoniam Antichristus venit, nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt; unde cognoscimus quoniam novissima hora est. Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis: si enim fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum: sed ut manifestarentur quoniam non sunt ex nobis. Cognoscite ergo quoniam omne mendacium extraneum est, et non est de veritate. Quis est mendax, nisi qui negat quoniam Jesus non est Christus? Hic est Antichristus.’”

If we go back to the former part of the second century we find this Epistle equally used. Polycarp, the disciple of John, says (ad Phil. c. 7): *πᾶς γὰρ ὁς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστι.* (See 1 John iv. 2, 3.)

So too Papias, who, as we learn from Eusebius (H. E. iii. 39), used testimonies from the former Epistle of John. If (as appears from the manner in which the Muratorian Canon connects them) the Gospel of St. John was accompanied by his first Epistle, the knowledge and use of the latter by Papias is so far a proof of his knowledge of the former.

The author of the Anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, who seems to have been a contemporary of Papias, uses certainly this Epistle.

§ 4. THE BOOK OF ACTS. The authorship and use of this book in the latter part of the second century is shewn by Irenaeus and the other witnesses, Clement and Tertullian. The first of these gives such full testimony that it might be said that all farther proof was superfluous.

The Muratorian Canon carries us back to the middle of the second century; and before this we find in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians one of those allusions to the words of the New Testament with which that writer abounds, which shews his acquaintance with the Acts: he says (c. 1) of Christ, *ὃν ἡγείρεν ὁ θεός, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ἄδου*. Compare Acts ii. 24, where the reading *ἄδου* instead of *θανάτου* is that of some other authorities.

We further find such an allusion to the Acts in the Epistle of Clement of Rome as is in itself a proof that he knew it in the first century itself. This allusion is seen from his quoting from the Old Testament in such a manner as to shew that it was not done altogether directly, but rather through the words of St. Paul, as recorded in the Acts.

The words of Clement (c. xviii.) are, *τί δὲ εἶπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυεῖδ, πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ θεός, Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυεῖδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ<sup>1</sup> ἔχρισα αὐτόν*; This is an evident reminiscence of the words of St. Paul, Acts xiii. 22, *ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας, Εὗρον Δαυεῖδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου* where the Apostle combines *ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ*, from 1 Sam. xiii. 14, with *εὗρον Δαυεῖδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου*, Ps. lxxxix. 21; in which he is followed by Clement, who adds more words from the Psalm: he not only shews his acquaintance with the book of Acts in this similarity of combination, but also by the allusion to *μαρτυρήσας* in the word *μεμαρτυρημένῳ*.

§ 5. ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. In the latter part of the second century the Epistles to which the name of the Apostle Paul is prefixed were used and known by the Churches as a collection, just as they are recognized by the Muratorian Canon: to this collection the name of *ἀπόστολος* was given at least as early as the time of Clement of Alexandria, by whom every one of these Epistles is quoted, with the single exception of that to Philemon:

<sup>1</sup> So the one MS. (Codex Alexandrinus) of Clement reads (spelling however *ελαει*); this is an instructive instance how the attempt to correct one mistake leads to another of a different kind; the reading of the LXX, as found in the original writing of the Codex Vaticanus, is *ἐλέει ἀγίῳ*; *ἐλαίῳ* and *ἐλέει* (*ελαει*) having been

confounded by a copyist. The change from *ἀγίῳ* to *αἰωνίῳ* seems to have sprung from the endeavour to connect a suitable epithet with *ἐλέει*. The Alexandrian MS. of the LXX has *ἐλαίῳ ἀγίῳ μου*; and so too the Codex Sinaiticus, except that *μου* was omitted by the original scribe.

Irenaeus similarly cites them all, omitting only the same short Epistle. Tertullian not only quotes every one of them, but in his fifth book against Marcion he discusses the alterations made in them by that false teacher to suit his peculiar scheme of doctrine. He notices (cap. 21) that while Marcion rejected the two Epistles to Timothy and that to Titus, he accepted without alteration this to Philemon addressed to an individual: “Soli huic epistulae brevis sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit.” He goes through the nine Epistles to Churches bearing Paul’s name, shewing what Marcion’s collection must have contained: and thus he makes particular mention of the *name* given by Marcion to the Epistle to the Ephesians: “Praetereo hic et de alia epistula quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodiceos.” (c. 11.) “Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator.” (c. 17.)

The analyses of St. Paul’s Epistles in Tertullian’s work against Marcion are very valuable, for they prove the identity of sentences as then read, and they carry us back as to the collection before it was tampered with by Marcion. But in his appeals to the places to which St. Paul wrote Epistles, he shews how the Churches in various lands were witnesses to what they had received. “Come now, thou who desirest better to exercise thy curiosity in that which relates to thy salvation: go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the chairs of the Apostles preside in their places, in which their authentic letters are recited, resounding the voice and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, [thou hast Thessalonica<sup>m</sup>]. If thou canst direct thy course into Asia, thou hast Ephesus<sup>n</sup>. But if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority [i. e. that of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans] is ready at hand for us also [in North Africa]. How happy is that Church on which Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood; where Peter suffered in the same manner as his Lord; where Paul was crowned with the death of John [the Baptist]; where the Apostle John, after he had been cast into

<sup>m</sup> The words “habes Thessalonicensis” are not found in the two extant MSS. of Tertullian, nor yet in the editio princeps (Basil. 1521), based on MS. authority, now apparently unknown. It seems to be an addition of some

one who did not see Tertullian’s object in referring to *four* countries.

<sup>n</sup> This is not to be overlooked in the questioning raised by Marcion as to the designation of this Epistle.

the fiery oil, and had suffered nothing, was banished to an island! Let us see what it learned, what it taught: it accords with the Churches of Africa also. It knows one God, the creator of all things; and Christ Jesus, born of the Virgin Mary, the Son of God the creator; and it knows the resurrection of the flesh: it mingles the law and the Prophets with the writings of Evangelists and Apostles<sup>o</sup>."

But with regard to some of St. Paul's individual Epistles, we can go farther back than the latter part of the second century, as shewing their use by ecclesiastical writers. This may be especially evinced from Old Testament citations having been taken not direct, but from St. Paul's Epistles. Thus Justin (Apol. i. 52) has *πάν γόνυ κάμψει τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται αὐτῷ*, where the form of the sentence follows the Apostle, Rom. xiv. 11, and not the LXX of Isaiah xlv. 23, of which the concluding words are *καὶ ὁμείται πάντα γλώσσα τὸν θεόν*. So too Dial. 39: *κύριε τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν· καὶ γὰρ ὑπελείφθη μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου . . . ἔτι εἰσὶ μοι ἑπτακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες οἱ οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ*: where the influence of Rom. xi. 3, 4 is far more to be seen than that of 1 Kings xix. 10, 14, 18 in the LXX. Compare also Justin's introductory words, *πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐντυγχάνων* with *ἐντυγχάνει*, Rom. xi. 2. These passages, in which the Old Testament is quoted through St. Paul, are the more marked from the close connection in which they stand to others in which the Old Testament is cited direct from the LXX. "Similar examples occur in other citations common to Justin and the Epistles to the Galatians and the Ephesians; and thus he appears to shew traces of the influence of all St. Paul's Epistles, with the exception of the Pastoral Epistles and those to the Philippians and Philemon:" Westcott (p. 147), who had rightly referred to Justin's controversy with Marcion in proof of his acquaintance with and use of St. Paul's Epistles in general, and had shewn that coincidence in language on the part of Justin was traceable with what is found in several of them.

<sup>o</sup> "Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tue, percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident, apud quas ipsae authenticæ litterae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, [habes Thessalonicenses]. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est. Ista quam

felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur, ubi Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Videmus quid didicerit, quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit. Unum Deum novit, creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex virgine Maria, filium Dei creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem; legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis miscet." (De Praes. Haer. 36.)

As to the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, we are able, through the testimony of Clement of Rome, to go back into the first century itself. In his Epistle to the Corinthian Church he says:—

“Why, then, do we rend and tear in pieces the members of Christ, and raise seditions against our own body? . . . Your schism has perverted many; it has discouraged many; it has caused diffidence in many, and grief in us all: and yet your sedition continues still. Take the Epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle into your hands:—what did he first write to you in the beginning of the Gospel? ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; In truth, he wrote to you by the Spirit concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then ye had made party-divisions.” (c. 47.)

Now the evidence by which letters are authenticated to future ages is often of a peculiar kind: a letter has not only a writer, but also a party to whom it is addressed. If a letter is brought forward in evidence, it is often sufficient if it can be shewn that such letter has been preserved in the proper custody:—if the party to whom it professes to be addressed preserves it as genuine, this is a presumption of the strongest kind that it is so; and thus the business of proving that it is *not* rests with the opposite party.

It is therefore worthy of particular notice that the Corinthian Church, to which Clement was writing in the name of the Church of Rome, were witnesses with him to the first Epistle to the Corinthians; even as Dionysius of Corinth was in the latter part of the second century to that of Clement; for in writing to Soter, bishop of Rome, he speaks of the Corinthian Church as having on that same day, the Lord's day, read both the Epistle of Soter (recently written), and that formerly addressed to them by Clement (Eus. H. E. iv. 23). Thus the Corinthian Church in the second century are witnesses to the Epistle of Clement; and thus indirectly (but not the less certainly) to the first of those addressed to them by St. Paul.

Now St. Paul had written to them in a tone of solemn reprehension; and yet they held it fast as genuine—a plain proof that they knew it to be such: the nature of the case, even if there were no other impossibilities, would preclude the thought of forgery. The Epistle was an evidence which condemned them, and yet they preserved it.

Though I am not speaking directly of the authority and inspiration of the New Testament books, yet this Epistle, attested as it is by strict lines of evidence of the strongest kind, as actually written by St. Paul to the Corinthian Church, calls for a passing notice on account of the peculiar nature of its contents. The writer speaks of the miraculous powers in the

gift of tongues which he himself possessed : he mentions this as well known by those to whom he wrote ; and their reception and preservation of the Epistle is a proof that such was the fact : endued with such powers, he claims authority to say, " If any man judge himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." He claims authority from God, which, as the Corinthians *knew*, was confirmed by miraculous powers. And further, he speaks of such powers as bestowed on some of the Corinthians themselves ;—a plain proof of the reality of the whole statement : to imagine the contrary would not only involve the supposition that the writer had lost his reason, but also that his readers at Corinth were all similarly affected.

It is also worthy of notice how in this Epistle St. Paul speaks of the leading *facts* of Christianity as matters of common knowledge. His appeal to the then still surviving majority of a company of more than five hundred, who had themselves seen the Lord Jesus after his resurrection, carries with it the greatest force : it presents to us the evidence of a body of persons, who were living witnesses of the truth of the leading miracle of the Gospel.

That Clement knew other Epistles of St. Paul is clear, although he does not expressly quote any but the first to the Corinthians. But he says—" Casting away from ourselves all unrighteousness and wickedness, covetousness, debate, malignity and deceit, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, despitefulness and pride, vaingloriousness and inanity. For those that commit such things are hated by God, and not only those that commit them, but those also that have pleasure in them." (c. 35.) In such a passage he had certainly Rom. i. 29-32 in his mind. Such sequences of words and *thoughts* cannot be fortuitous. He is writing in the name of the Roman Church, which thus acknowledges the Epistle to the Romans.

Somewhat similarly Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, is a witness to that which the Apostle Paul had addressed to the same Church. He speaks of the blessed and glorious Paul, " who when he was amongst you taught accurately and confirmedly in the presence of the men who then were ; who also when absent wrote letters<sup>p</sup> to you." (c. iii.) Throughout his Epistle Polycarp interweaves Scripture sentences, which shew not only his familiarity with the New Testament writings, but which presuppose the same on the part of his readers. Thus : " The love of money is the beginning of all sorrows : *we brought nothing into this world, neither have*

<sup>p</sup> It is scarcely needful to remark that the plural may refer to one letter only.

*we anything to carry out.*" (c. iv.) "We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and each one must give account of himself." (c. vi.) "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world? *as Paul teaches.*" (c. xi. Lat.) "Be ye angry, and sin not, and let not the sun go down upon your wrath." (c. xii. Lat.) Do not these passages shew the use made by Polycarp of the first Epistle to Timothy, that to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians? The use of the last-mentioned is all the more striking from the sentence of the Old Testament being combined with the same addition. Elsewhere he refers to the same Epistle, saying, "Knowing that by grace ye are saved, not of works." (c. i.)

The testimonies which bring us back, as to some of these Epistles, to the Apostolic age have no small cogency as to the collection; for when we compare these Epistles together, we may see how thoroughly they bear the impress of the same mind.

Now there are no ancient works possessed of greater weight of evidence than these writings. We receive Cicero's letters as genuine, and yet no one supposes that we could find *each* one severally mentioned by an ancient writer: the quotations from some are considered as evidence to the collection as such. These Epistles are all mentioned severally as existing, and as publicly used in the second century—as being then known as documents of established credit—not some anonymous productions, but each bearing on its front a certificate of origin which was then regarded as authentic, and which had been so previously.

It would be impossible to be more absolutely certain even as to the letters of Bentley<sup>a</sup> or Cowper.

<sup>a</sup> This holds good, even though some things have been admitted doubtfully into Bentley's Correspondence which do not belong to him; even as supposititious Epistles were in the second century ascribed to St. Paul: in each case critical examination is needed, and the result is to elicit truth.

Archdeacon Wordsworth, in Bentley's Correspondence, vol. ii. p. 698, has inserted (with a mark of doubt) a restoration of an inscription to Jupiter Urius; and at p. 711 an answer to an inquiry as to the meaning of "Yonane" in the date of a MS. sent from Persia. These papers had been published at Cambridge in 1742, in Dr. John Taylor's "Commentarius ad Legem Decemviralem de Inope Debitore," who says that he received them from *Aristarchus Cantabrigiensis*. Dr. Wordsworth, after

stating who had ascribed these productions to Bentley, adds that others have attributed them to Dr. Charles Ashton, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. Taylor says distinctly that *both* were written by the *same* Aristarchus. *Suum cuique*: they do not belong to Bentley; this is proved by the statement of the person for whom the answer relative to the era of Yonane was written. "At de aera Yonanes, mihi haud minus quam amico [Samueli Palmer sc. qui codicem ad Ridleium miserat] incognita, dum quae sit haerebam, facillime me expedit vir summae eruditionis, nuper Collegii Jesu apud Cantabrigienses Praeses ornatissimus." [Ad imam paginam additur "Carolus Ashton, D.D."] Gloucester Ridley, De Syr. N. F. Versionum indole atque usu. (p. 5. In Semler's Reprint, p. 255.) This settles the question. Farther

§ 6. THE EPISTLES OF JUDE AND JOHN. We need not be surprised that in the case of some shorter writings there should be no express citations from them, or mention made of them, by those who did not profess to give lists of the New Testament books.

Tertullian quotes once from the Epistle of Jude; but that once is quite decisive: he will not reject the so-called Book of Enoch, supposing that it has the sanction of the New Testament: “Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de Domino praedicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem, divinitus inspirari. A Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta, sicut et cetera fere quae Christum sonant. Nec utique mirum hoc, si scripturas aliquas non receperunt de eo locutas, quem et ipsum coram loquentem non erant recepturi. Eo accedit, quod Enoch *apud Judam apostolum* testimonium possidet.” (De Cult. Fem. i. 3.)

Clement of Alexandria quotes this Epistle most distinctly, εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας, βούλομαι ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἄπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου λαὸν σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν· ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων τετήρηκεν. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν διδασκαλικώτατα ἐκτίθεται τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν κρινομένων· οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. (Paed. iii. 8. p. 280 Potter.) ἐπὶ τούτων, οἰμᾶι, καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι, Ὅμοίως μὲν τοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι· ὁ γὰρ ὕπαρ, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐπιβάλλουσιν, ἕως Καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα. (Strom. iii. 2. p. 515.) τοιοῦτος οἶός τε ἐκείνῳ πείθεσθαι τῷ παραγγέλματι, Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε. (Strom. vi. 8. p. 773.)

Clement also speaks of Jude in the Adumbrationes (which we only have in the Latin version of Cassiodorus): “Judas qui catholicam scripsit Epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph<sup>r</sup>, exstans valde religiosus, quum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit seipsum fratrem ejus esse; Sed quid dixit? Judas *servus Jesu Christi*, utpote Domini, *frater autem Jacobi*; hoc enim verum est, frater erat ejus, [filius] Joseph.” (p. 1007.)

Thus at the close of the second century this Epistle was used and

on Dr. Ridley corrects the error which he had made when sending the inquiry to Cambridge, by which he had called the MS. *Persic* instead of Syriac; an error which stands at the head of the letter, p. 711, in Bentley's Correspondence.

<sup>r</sup> This appears to be a confusion in the ren-

dering into Latin; the meaning seems to be “*the Lord's* brother, one of the sons of Joseph,” perhaps it was τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφός, ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ. Presently after, “filius” is added by Bunsen before “Joseph,” as necessary to the sentence.

known, in full accordance with what is stated in the Muratorian Fragment. No argument can be based on the silence of Irenaeus.

Irenaeus cites the second Epistle of John, "quos et Dominus nobis cavere praedixit, et discipulus ejus Joannes in praedicta epistola fugere eos praecepit dicens, Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesus Christum in carne venisse. Hic est seductor et Antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdatiis quod operati estis." (C. II. iii. 16. § 8.) It will be observed that this is, according to the Latin translator, "in praedicta epistola," the *first* having been cited, § 5, "in epistola sua," as if he regarded the second as a part of the first; but *immediately* after the words just quoted he says, "Et rursus in epistola ait, Multi pseudoprophetae exierunt de saeculo," &c. Hence there seems to be confusion as to how many Epistles should be ascribed to St. John, and whether in fact the second Epistle was not regarded as an appendix to the first. (Compare Eus. II. E. iii. 39, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας [not πρώτης]). In a former place (C. II. i. 16, § 3), Irenaeus cites from John, the disciple of the Lord, Ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτοῖς, φησί, χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν τοῖς πονηροῖς.

That Clement of Alexandria included the second Epistle of John in his Hypotyposes or Adumbrationes appears to be certain. His silence as to the third can prove (as Westcott has well remarked) no more than that he was unacquainted with it. The same may be true of others, or else that they had no occasion to quote from so short a writing.

But no silence can invalidate the previous testimony of the Muratorian Canon, which places "in catholica," *two* Epistles of John (besides apparently that previously cited) and that of Jude.

The third Epistle of John was known by the heretical author of the Clementine Homilies; if ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἀληθῶς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συνεργῆσαι θέλεις (Hom. xvii. 19) comes from 3 John 8 ἵνα συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

§ 7. THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN. For scarcely any book of the New Testament is there such overwhelming evidence in the second century as there is for the Revelation. Andreas, in his Prologue to the book, mentions Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, as amongst the ἀρχαιότεροι who had maintained its divine inspiration; and on Rev. xii. 9 he gives a quotation from "Papias, the successor of John the Evangelist."

Justin Martyr bears distinct testimony to the book and to its author: "Moreover a certain man amongst us named John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in a Revelation made to him, prophesied that those who believed on our Christ should spend a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that

afterwards should be the universal, and, so to speak, eternal resurrection of all at once, and judgment." (Dial. § 81.) Where Justin says (Ap. i. 28), "The leader of the evil demons is called by us Serpent, and Satan, and Devil," he seems not only to use the thoughts, but even the words of Rev. xii. 9, and xx. 2<sup>s</sup>. Farther on, in the same century, Melito of Sardis wrote on "the Apocalypse of John." Dionysius of Corinth used words from the Apocalypse, so as to shew that both he and those to whom he wrote admitted its authority. So too the use of the Apocalypse in the Epistle of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons to their brethren in Asia (A. D. 177), shews that as to this there was no question; Rev. xxii. 11 is introduced thus: ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, Ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι. (Eus. H. E. v. 1. 53.) Potheinus, the bishop of Vienne, was at the time of this persecution ninety years old; his life thus reached into the Apostolic age. Irenaeus used this book extensively; he speaks with all definiteness as to its author, and gives us undoubting information as to when it was written: οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς. (C. H. v. 30. § 3.) But even as to the readings of the Apocalypse, Irenaeus could appeal to those who had known John personally, such for instance probably as Polycarp; τούτων δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τούτου κειμένου, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐωρακότων, καὶ τοῦ λόγου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ὁ ἀριθμὸς τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ψῆφον διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων, sexcentos habebit et sexaginta et sex: hoc est, decadas aequales hecatontasin et hecatontadas aequales monasin . . . . οἱ δὲ κατὰ ἀπειροκαλίαν ἐτόλμησαν καὶ ὄνομα ἀναζητεῖν ἔχον τὴν ἐσφαλμένον καὶ διημαρτημένον ἀριθμόν· ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀκάκως τοῦτο ποιήσασιν, εἰκὸς καὶ τυγγνώμην ἔσεσθαι παρὰ θεοῦ. (C. H. v. 30. § 1.) We know from Eusebius (H. E. iv. 24) that Theophilus of Antioch in the same age "used testimonies from the Revelation of John."

Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian are frequent in their use of the Apocalypse as authoritative, and they speak of it as the Revelation of John. Tertullian is express in defining *what* John he means, "*Apostolus Joannes in Apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Dei (? Domini) prodeuntem bis acutum praeacutum, quem intellegi oportet sermonem divinum, bis acutum duobus testamentis legis et evangelii.*" (c. Marc. iii. 14.)

So full and explicit is the testimony of writers that lived in the second century to the authority of the book of Revelation, as the work of the Apostle John, that they seem to have answered by anticipation the

<sup>s</sup> This is strongly confirmed by the following words: ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συγγραμμάτων ἐρευνήσαντες, μαθεῖν δύνασθε.

objections which were raised in later ages to its genuineness<sup>t</sup>. To these testimonies nothing seems needful to be added; for at the end of the second century the point was one admitting of no question at all. If farther authorities as to the matter of fact were needed, we only have to refer to Hippolytus at Rome, and Origen in Palestine or Egypt, in the former part of the third century. Those who prefer evidence to subjective surmises, will find no difficulty as to the judgment which they should form<sup>u</sup>.

Thus the testimony of the Muratorian Canon is in full accordance with what, as we learn from other sources, were received in the second century as Divine books of the New Testament. This list brings into one focus the rays of truth which elsewhere shine as it were separately. It may be noticed that this Canon recognizes the Apocalypse, Jude, and apparently 2 and 3 John, all of which in the former part of the fourth century were "doubted by some." There is not one of *these* writings as to which we have elsewhere to go for testimony beyond the limit of those who lived in the second century.

On the other hand, this Canon gives no sanction to any writing as a book fully received as part of the New Testament, which has since been rejected as spurious.

The evidence, as given throughout this Part, is taken rather on the principle of *selection*, than as stating all that can be brought forward.

<sup>t</sup> It is worthy of some remark that so much evidence in favour of this book comes to us from Asia Minor, the very country to the Churches of which it was sent: Polycarp of Smyrna, Melito of Sardis, Irenaeus with his early connection with Ephesus, and Papias of Hierapolis, the neighbour city to Laodicea.

<sup>u</sup> So much has been said as to the difference of phraseology and style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel of John, that it is well to bear in mind that in many cases, even in ordinary writing, *the subject forms the style*: how peculiarly then must this have been the case with John in writing the Apocalypse, where the vividness and intensity of the subjects cause the things communicated to be presented so forcibly that all other considerations give way: grammatical constructions change or

are resumed, just as the subject seems to demand.

St. John's style appears to have been peculiarly moulded according to the language of others which he records:—(this remark is made without in any degree overlooking the fact of inspiration in all its fulness;) and this one consideration may cause much difficulty to disappear. In the Gospel and the Revelation the portion is considerable which records the language of others. In Bishop Lloyd's Oxford Greek Testament the number of *lines* in the Apocalypse is 1460; of which 564, nearly *two-fifths* of the book, are the words of language which he records. In the same edition, in the Gospel of St. John the number of lines is 2340, of which more than half, 1370, are simply recorded words.

## PART V.

## The Books not mentioned in the Muratorian Canon.

§ 1. FOUR books, which now form part of the New Testament, are not mentioned in this ancient list—Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, and James: from whatever cause the omission arose, it may be regarded as certain that the writer *must* have been acquainted with the former *two*, and probably with the Epistle of James also. These four must be considered irrespective of the Fragment; and as to them on some points we may have to go beyond the limit of the second century.

HEBREW. The collection of St. Paul's Epistles, known in the second century as ἀποστόλος, contained the thirteen to which his name is prefixed, all of which are mentioned in the Fragment. But besides these there is the Epistle to the Hebrews, about which the question was not so much the canonicity as the authorship. Its early reception and use are therefore to be considered wholly apart from inquiries as to the writer.

The reception and use of this book in the Apostolic age itself is proved by the manner in which Clement of Rome interweaves the words and thoughts taken from it with that which he was writing. This was observed of old, as we know from Eusebius: . . . καὶ τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν τῇ ἀνωμολογημένῃ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἦν ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ Κορινθίων διευτρώσατο. ἐν ᾗ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθείς, ἥδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεῖ ρήτοϊς τισὶν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νεὸν ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα. ὅθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν, αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου. (H. E. iii. 37<sup>a</sup>.)

As to the use made of this Epistle by Clement, it has been said “allusions *prove* nothing;” however in such a case as this they prove a great deal. He who approvingly interweaves extracts from a writing claiming authority, so far as in him lies sanctions that authority; and this Clement has done. It would be long to give the reiterated passages in

<sup>a</sup> Jerome's account of Clement may be compared:—“Clemens . . . quartus post Petrum Romae episcopus, siquidem secundus Linus fuit, tertius Anacletus; tametsi plerique Latinorum secundum post Petrum apostolum putent fuisse Clementem. Scripsit ex persona Romanae ecclesiae ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quae et in nonnullis

locis publice legitur, quae mihi videtur characteri epistolae, quae sub Pauli nomine ad Hebraeos fertur, convenire. Sed et multis de eadem epistola, non solum sensibus, sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est.” (De Viris Ill. xv.)

which Clement uses the thoughts and words of this Epistle<sup>b</sup>: much is shewn by one allusion. He says (c. 9), λάβωμεν Ἐνώχ, ὃς ἐν ὑπακοῇ δίκαιος εὐρεθεὶς μετετέθη, καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος. Now whence does he obtain the peculiar statement, “his death was not found?” not from Gen. v. 24, in which we find simply καὶ οὐκ εὐρίσκετο, without a word about death. But in Heb. xi. 5 we read, πίστει Ἐνώχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον καὶ οὐχ ἠύρίσκετο, κ. τ. λ., where a reader might suppose the nom. to οὐχ ἠύρίσκετο to be θάνατος, and thus the strange remark of Clement has evidently originated.

Justin Martyr says of our Lord (Apol. i. 63), καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος (compare also § 12): the latter designation is only found in Heb. iii. 1.

Eusebius (H. E. v. 26), when speaking of the writings of Irenaeus, mentions βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων, ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς λεγομένης σοφίας Σολομῶντος μνημονεύει, ρητά τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος.

In his extant writings we find allusions to this Epistle; “Solus hic Deus invenitur, qui omnia fecit, solus omnipotens, et solus pater condens et faciens omnia, et visibilia et invisibilia, et sensibilia et insensata, et caelestia et terrena, *verbo virtutis suae*.” (C. H. ii. 30. § 9.) See Heb. i. 3.

“Rursus autem qui nude tantum hominem eum dicunt ex Joseph generatum, perseverantes in servitute pristinae inobedientiae moriuntur, *nondum commixti verbo Dei patris, neque per Filium percipientes libertatem*.” (C. H. iii. 19. § 1.) See Heb. iv. 2.

[Exteriores munditiae], “quae in figuram futurorum traditae erant, velut umbrae cujusdam descriptionem faciente lege atque delineante de temporalibus aeterna, de terrenis caelestia.” (C. H. iv. 11. § 4.) See Heb. x. 1; viii. 5; ix. 23.

ὅπου γε Ἐνώχ εὐαρεστήσας τῷ θεῷ, ἐν σώματι μετετέθη, τὴν μετάθεσιν τῶν δικαίων προμηνύων. (C. H. v. 5. § 1.) See Heb. xi. 5, which is more connected verbally with the citation of Irenaeus than is Gen. v. 24.

But although Irenaeus certainly knew, and to some extent used this Epistle, it is stated by Photius that he denied it to be the work of the Apostle Paul<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> One passage of Clement will shew his mode of using the Epistle to the Hebrews:—ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτον μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν. γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, Ὁ ποιῶν . . . πυρὸς φλογά [Psa. cīv. 4]. ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ νύμφῳ αὐτοῦ οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης, Υἱός μου . . . γεγέν. σε [Ps. ii. 7] αἰτῆσαι παρ’ ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ

πέρατα τῆς γῆς· καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου [Ps. cx. 1]. (cap. 36.)

<sup>c</sup> In the second of the Fragments published by Pfaff in 1715, as bearing the name of Irenaeus (ed. Stieren, p. 854, W. W. Harvey, ii. p. 500) it is said, καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ ἡμᾶς παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἡμῶν. καὶ πάλιν, Ἀναφέ-

Clement of Alexandria, however, not only ascribed this Epistle to St. Paul, but, in speaking of his predecessor Pantaenus apparently, he says, ἥδη δὲ ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ κύριος ἀπόστολος ὦν τοῦ παντοκράτορος, ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετρίότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον· διὰ τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμὴν, διὰ τε τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον. (ap. Eus. H. E. vi. 14.)

Clement quotes from *Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews*, chap. v. ver. 12 (Strom. vi. 8. p. 771 Potter) expressly: he is spoken of by Eusebius as saying that it was Paul's, and written to the Hebrews in Hebrew, but carefully translated by Luke and given forth to the Greeks; whence he says the complexion of this Epistle as translated is the same as that of the Acts. (H. E. vi. 14.) So that although at Alexandria it was regarded as Pauline, its actual form and phraseology (differing so much from the Epistles which bear the Apostle's name) was deemed to be rather of the school of Paul than from the Apostle himself. The theory of a translation appears to have been assumed to meet supposed difficulties.

Tertullian expressly cites this Epistle as the work of Barnabas: "Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctorati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore, 'Aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?' Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho pastore moechorum [sc. Herma]. Monens itaque discipulos, omissis omnibus initiis, ad perfectionem magis tendere, nec rursus fundamenta paenitentiae jacere ab operibus mortuorum. Impossibile est enim, inquit, eos qui semel illuminati sunt, et donum caeleste gustaverunt, et participaverunt spiritum sanctum et verbum dei dulce gustaverunt, occidente jam aevo cum exciderint, rursus revocari in paenitentiam, refigentes cruci in semetipsos filium dei et dedecorantes. Terra enim, quae bibit saepius devenientem in se humorem et peperit herbam aptam his propter quos et colitur, bene-

ρμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως τοῦτ' ἔστι καρπὸν χειλέων: where Heb. xiii. 15 seems to be equally with Rom. xii. 1 attributed to St. Paul.

It is needless to say how keenly the genuineness of these Pfaffian Fragments was debated, and what different opinions still exist on the subject; the good faith of Pfaff himself seems to have been doubted by no one. The more general feeling amongst scholars seems now to be in favour of these Fragments. Probably

Irenaeus did not so connect Heb. xiii. 15 with Rom. xii. 1, as to assert that St. Paul was the author of the former Epistle.

Photius's statement rests on what he cites from Stephanus Gobarus (of the sixth century): ὅτι Ἰππόλυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου οὐκ ἐκείνους εἶναι φασί. Cod. 232. (ed. Bekker. p. 291 b. 12.) Does Stephanus mean that they said this Epistle was not Paul's, or that they did not say it was his?

dictionem Dei consequitur; proferens autem spinas reproba et maledictioni proxima, cujus finis in exustionem. Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam moeche et fornicatori secundam paenitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat. Optime enim legem interpretabatur, et figuras ejus jam in ipsa veritate servabat." (De Pudicitia 20.)

It has been said that Tertullian nowhere quotes this Epistle but in one place (that given above); but while the sparing use made of it contrasts greatly with his citations from the collection of Epistles bearing St. Paul's name, there are other traces of his acquaintance with it and use of it. Thus, "Nam et Enoch justissimum non circumcicum nec sabbatizantem, de hoc mundo transtulit, *qui necdum mortem gustavit*, ut aeternitatis candidatus jam nobis ostenderet nos quoque sine legis onere Moysis Deo posse placere." (Adv. Judaeos 2<sup>d</sup>.) The words "*qui necdum mortem gustavit*" come from Heb. xi. 5, and not from Gen. v. 24. "Translatus est Enoch et Helias, *nec mors eorum reperta est*, dilata scilicet. Ceterum morituri reservantur, ut antichristum sanguine suo extinguant." (De Anima 50.) Here the statement "their *death* was not found" springs from the same misconstruction of Heb. xi. 5, as was made by Clement of Rome.

In Hippolytus, in the early part of the third century, we find but little *certain* use of this book, in contrast to the citations from all the collection of Epistles bearing St. Paul's name, with the exception of that to Philemon; so that Photius (cod. 121<sup>e</sup>) is probably right in saying that he did not ascribe the authorship to St. Paul. But the little that we do find is worthy of notice, as shewing that those are mistaken who have overlooked what exists.

εἰπὼν τὰ ἐξῆς λέγει λοιπὸν ὡς ἐξ οἰκείου προσώπου ὁ χριστός, . . . (expounding the 69th Psalm of our Lord) διὸ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἡδολέσχουν οἱ καθηήμενοι ἐν πύλαις (lxviii. 13 LXX. ἐν πύλῃ) ἔξω γὰρ τῆς πύλης (Heb. xiii. 12) με ἐσταύρωσαν. (Demonst. adv. Judaeos 3. ii. p. 3 Fabricius, pp. 64, 5 Lagarde.)

ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ θεοῦ, Heb. x. 31. (De Susanna, p. 276 Fabr., p. 149 Lagarde.)

διὰ θανάτου τὸν θάνατον νικῶν (De Chr. et Antichr. 26. p. 4 Fabricius, p. 13 Lagarde) appears to be a reminiscence of Heb. ii. 14<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>d</sup> This work of Tertullian appears to have been of late doubted by some scholars; but there appear to be no grounds for rejecting at least the former part. But even if it is not Tertullian's, the objection will not apply to his book De Anima, from which an allusion is immediately cited.

<sup>e</sup> Ed. Bekker 94 a. l. 33. Compare also

what Photius quotes as to Hippolytus from Stephanus Gobarus.

<sup>f</sup> If the *genuineness* of Hippolytus *περὶ χειροτονιῶν*, from the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, were certain, the citation of Heb. xiii. 17 αὐτοὶ γὰρ . . . ἀποδώσουσιν (p. 89 Lagarde) would be worthy of especial notice, but the use of the above passages suffices.

Origen, the younger contemporary of Hippolytus, repeatedly cites the Epistle, and often ascribes it to Paul: but when he discusses more precisely and critically the actual authorship, it is evident that he means that it came rather from the school of Paul, and was Pauline in a more general sense, than that it had been written actually by the Apostle himself. Eusebius thus records Origen's counselled opinion on the subject: ἔτι πρὸς τοῦτοις περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν Ὀμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει· ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τούτεστι τῇ φράσει· ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φρασέων διαφοράς, ὁμολογήσαι ἂν. πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφέσαι εἶναι ἀληθές, πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποιμ' ἂν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστὶν· ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὥσπερ εἰ σχολιογραφῆσαντός τινος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκίμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. τις δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὸ μὲν ἀληθές θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς Πράξεις. (H. E. vi. 25.)

Eusebius in another place seems to ascribe the actual Greek of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Clement of Rome; for after speaking of his Epistle to the Corinthians, in which so much from the Epistle to the Hebrews was inserted αὐτολεξεί, he continues, ὅθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίους γλώσσης ἐγγράφως ὠμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἐρμηνεύσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφὴν· ὁ καὶ μᾶλλον ἂν εἴη ἀληθές, τῷ τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τὴν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι. (H. E. iii. 37.)

We may be quite certain that in no sense did this Epistle proceed from Clement; for if so he would not quote it as he has done, and especially would he not shew that he misunderstood it.

The place which this Epistle occupies in the older Greek MSS. is in full accordance with its being considered Pauline; for it is inserted in the previously formed collection of Epistles which bear the Apostle's name, after those to Churches, and before those to individuals: it is so found also in the Memphitic version. There is a trace of a more ancient arrangement in the Vatican MS.; for while the Epistle now stands after 2 Thess., the

notation of sections shews that it was in an older copy from which this sprung, placed between Galatians and Ephesians: these sections run on continuously through St. Paul's Epistles; the last in Galatians is 58, while Hebrews begins with the 59th. In the Thebaic version its place was before Galatians.

In the Western MSS., Greek or Latin, it is subjoined to the Pauline collection, as in our English Bible.

The testimony of Tertullian that the author was Barnabas, is not to be regarded as merely an individual opinion; it was clearly that of those for whom he wrote, as well as his own; and it is stated as a known fact, and not as a supposition. A trace of this belief as to the authorship is long afterwards found in the West: in the Stichometry of the books of the New Testament in the Codex Claromontanus, between the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation, we find, "Barnabae Epist. ver. DCCCL.;" that this is our Canonical Epistle to the Hebrews, and not the Apocryphal writing which bears the name of Barnabas, may be seen by the length; for that pseudonymous Epistle has in the Stichometry of Nicephorus 1360 lines instead of 850. The Hebrews elsewhere has 703 to 830.

Thus the name of the actual writer of the Epistle remains without further light thrown upon it. It is rather for us to imitate the wisdom of those who in the third century called it St. Paul's in a general sense, as coming from his school, and as received into the collection of Epistles bearing his name, while saying as to the actual writer with Origen, *τις ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστόλην τὸ ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν*.

§ 2. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER. This Epistle, though omitted in the Muratorian Canon, is one that never was doubted. Papias (as we learn from Eusebius H. E. iii. 39) used testimonies from it. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, brings in the words and phrases as though not only was he familiar with it himself, but also the Church to which he was writing. Thus in chap. i. he says: "In whom not having seen ye believe, and believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, into which (joy) many desire to enter." In chap. ii.: "Wherefore having girt up your loins, serve God with fear and truth, having left behind empty conversation of foolishness, having believed in Him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead and gave Him glory, and a throne at His right hand." His use of this Epistle was noticed by Eusebius (iv. 14). In the latter part of the second century Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria quote this Epistle by *name* as Peter's ("Petrus ait

in epistola sua." C. H. iv. 9. § 2. *φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος*, Strom. iv. 7. p. 584 Potter), in addition to the Christian writers who use it without giving any reference.

In one work of Tertullian, *Scorpiace* (or *Contra Gnosticos*), is this Epistle cited, and that expressly: "Petrus quidem ad Ponticos, Quanta enim, inquit, gloria si non ut delinquentes puniamini sustinetis? Haec enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis, quoniam et Christus passus est pro nobis, relinquens vobis exemplum semetipsum, uti adsequamini vestigia ipsius. Et rursus, Dilecti, ne epavescatis ustionem, quae agitur in vobis in temptationem, quasi novum accadat vobis. Etenim secundum quod communicatis passionibus Christi, gaudete, uti et in revelatione gloriae ejus gaudeatis exultantes. Si dedecoramini in nomine Christi, beati estis, quod gloria et Dei Spiritus requiescit in vobis, dum ne quis vestrum patiatur ut homicida aut fur aut maleficus aut alieni speculator, si autem ut Christianus, ne erubescat, glorificet autem Dominum (s. Deum) in nomine isto." (cap. 12.) "Condixerat scilicet Petrus, Regem quidem honorandum." (cap. 14.)

This peculiar use on the part of Tertullian of this Epistle, so different from his habitual quotations from the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles, was natural with regard to any work which existed as yet only separately, and not in either of the collections of books which were in constant use in the services of the Church. It may be that such single separate writings were only occasionally available by a Christian author like Tertullian; and thus, until collected for public use, they might be but rarely or not at all employed.

This Epistle is addressed to the elect strangers of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; and this makes all testimonies from Asia Minor the more significant. It seems (ch. v. 13) to have been written in the neighbourhood of Babylon, some time probably before the Apostle's journey to the West, when he suffered martyrdom at Rome.

The Epistle to the Hebrews and the first of Peter were so known in the second century, and so universally received, that we cannot suppose them to have been rejected by the author of the Fragment, or to have been writings with which he was unacquainted. We know that in copying the extract from Ambrose the second time, the scribe omitted *two lines and a half* (11<sup>b</sup> of MS. line 29, see p. 22); a similar omission here would fully account for any apparent silence: or the mention of these writings may not have been extracted from the work of the author, or he might have had no occasion to speak of them.

§ 3. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER. The writings of the New Testament have been transmitted to us with various degrees of external testimony; as to some, such as the Gospel of St. John and the First of Corinthians, we have absolute evidence (more so than is the case with regard to any profane writings whatsoever); while as to others, such as the second Epistle of Peter and that of James, we have far less. This must be distinctly stated; for not unfrequently the opposers of the Records of our religion try to lower all evidence to that which is the least strong, instead of owning the absolute testimony in favour of particular books,—evidence which amounts to the fullest demonstration, and which no one can reject who is not prepared to cast aside all proof, whether moral or mathematical. This must especially be remembered when a book has to be considered like the second Epistle of Peter, not universally owned and known in the early ages, like the Gospel of St. John, even from the very time of the author, by the universal Christian community in weekly public use; but rather one about which doubts were felt, and which was comparatively little used.

The second Epistle of Peter is written (iii. 1) to the same persons as were the receivers of the first; and it is from Cappadocia, one of the countries thus addressed, that we have in the middle of the third century our first clear and definite mention of this Epistle. Firmilianus, bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, when writing to Cyprian against Stephanus, bishop of Rome, on the question of those who had been baptized by heretics, says: “Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt, adhuc etiam infamans *Petrum* et *Paulum*, beatos apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint, *qui in epistolis suis* haereticos execrati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerunt.” (In opp. Cypriani, ed. Baluze, p. 144.) No other Epistle but this suits the description. Nor was Firmilianus a person of but little note in the Christian community at large; his intercourse had been wide, and in the same Epistle (p. 142) he says, “Gratias propter hoc Domino maximas egimus quod contigerit ut qui corpore ab invicem separamur, sic spiritu adunemur quasi non unam tantum regionem tenentes, sed in ipsa atque in eadem domo simul inhabitantes.” He seeks Christian unity in dogmatic truth rather than in uniformity of observance, for he thus introduces the words above quoted relative to St. Peter’s Epistles: “Eos autem qui Romae sunt non ea in omnibus observare quae sint ab origine tradita et frustra apostolorum auctoritatem praetendere scire quis etiam inde potest quod circa celebrandos dies Paschae et circa multa alia divinae rei sacramenta videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates, nec observari illic omnia aequa-

liter quae Hierosolymis observantur, secundum quod in caeteris quoque plurimis provinciis multa pro locorum et nominum diversitate variantur, nec tamen propter hoc ab ecclesiae catholicae pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est<sup>g</sup>.”

Thus from the Cappadocian bishop we have within two centuries definite testimony to the Epistle written to that very region by the Apostle Peter. And Firmilianus writes mentioning how his acquaintance extends ‘per Cappadociam et per Pontum,’ so that we have not to think of mere individual opinion, but to know that we have the testimony of one holding a public place in that country. Thus this account comes to us attesting the second Epistle of Peter as known in what might be regarded as the proper custody. This alone has a great and in general a decisive weight. What is sufficient to silence all questions as to many of Luther’s letters published (at a far longer subsequent interval than that from St. Peter to Firmilianus) for the first time by De Wette? Simply this, that the letters had been preserved in the proper custody. This has its weight as to the second Epistle of Peter in all the subsequent discussions.

Origen knew of this Epistle, as might be supposed, from his intercourse with Cappadocians and friendship with Firmilianus; but he mentions how it was doubted by some. Πέτρος δὲ ἐφ’ ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία . . . μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. (Ap. Eus. H. E. vi. 25.) In accordance with this we find, as we might have expected, few satisfactory traces of this Epistle in his extant works.

From that time in the third century this Epistle was known, whatever opinions were formed about it: Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) records as a fact that ἡ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ was one τῶν δ’ ἀντιλεγόμενων, γνωρίμων δ’ οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς<sup>h</sup>.

Having thus established the fact that this Epistle was known in the third century, and that it was then preserved in the proper custody, allusions or quotations in previous writers may be examined; premising however, that being a writing as yet not belonging to any recognized collection, we ought not to expect to find it other than little known.

<sup>g</sup> But he looks on the then Roman bishop as an introducer of something new: “Ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat.” (p. 148.) An Epistle of *Peter* is quoted as authority against Peter’s *successor*; hence

the point of the argument.

<sup>h</sup> It has indeed been stated, that though Eusebius knew of this Epistle he never uses it; but when (H. E. iii. 24) he says of the Apostles, τὴν δὲ γλῶτταν ιδιωτεύοντες τῇ γερμῇ πρὸς τοῦ σωτῆρος αὐτοῖς δεδορημένην θεία καὶ παραδοξοποιῶ δυνάμει θαρσύνοντες, he seems to bear in mind 2 Pet. i. 3, τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδορημένης.

In the former part of the third century Hippolytus has οἱ πρὸς μὲν ὦραν αἰδοῦμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συναγόμενοι ὁμολόγουν, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν βόρβορον ἀνεκυλίουτο. (Philosophumena ix. 7. p. 279 Miller, p. 440 Duncker.) Here the words of 2 Pet. ii. 22 are simply interwoven by the writer.

In the latter part of the second century Theophilus of Antioch uses expressions which seem to imply a knowledge of this Epistle. His words ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκῇματι συνεχομένῳ (ad Autol. ii. 13) deserve to be compared with i. 19, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνονται ἐν ἀνχυρῳ τόπῳ: and οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφητῆται γενόμενοι (ii. 9) with i. 21, οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία ἀλλ' ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. See also αἱ ἅγιοι γραφαί, καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι (ii. 22). Each seems to be a probable allusion, and the combination strengthens this probability to a high degree.

Irenaeus uses an expression with regard to St. Peter, which in this Epistle he applies to himself: σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. (i. 15.) Irenaeus (C. H. iii. 1. § 1), after speaking of the preaching of Peter and Paul, adds that μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, wrote down the things which he had taught. If this be a mere coincidence, it is at least remarkable: it may rather seem that the name of Peter suggested the use of this unaccustomed expression to denote his death: how little it has been considered a usual or probable term has been shewn by its having been doubted whether Irenaeus did not merely mean Peter's departure from Rome. A comparison with this Epistle seems to shew that it was employed in a *Petrine* sense.

There is a sentence given as a quotation by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and others<sup>i</sup>, as to which it has been doubted whether they quote from Psalm xc. or from 2 Pet. The passages are at least worthy of consideration.

ὥς γὰρ τῷ Ἀδὰμ εἶρητο ὅτι ἡ δ' ἂν ἡμέρα φάγη ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου ἐν ἐκείῃ ἀποθανεῖται, ἔγνωμεν αὐτὸν μὴ ἀναπληρώσαντα χίλια ἔτη· συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγει. (Justin. Dial. § 81.)

ὅσαις . . . ἡμέραις ἐγένετο ὁ κόσμος, τοσαύταις χιλιοντάσι συντελείται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ἡ γραφή, καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν. καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ 5' τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐποίησε, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ 7' ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τῶν προγεγονότων διήγησις, καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων προφητεία. ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς 1000 ἔτη ἐν ἑξ ὧν ἡμεραίς συντελέσται τὰ γεγονότα· φανερόν οὖν ὅτι ἡ συντελεία αὐτῶν τὸ 5 ἔτος ἐστί. (C. H. v. 28. § 3.) “Quidam autem rursus in millesimum annum revocant

<sup>i</sup> Hippolytus follows them in quoting it; Lagarde, p. 153.) ἡμέρα δὲ κυρίου χίλια ἔτη. ἡμέρα γὰρ κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη (in Dan. 4. ed. (ibid. 6. p. 154.)

mortem Adae; quoniam enim *dies Domini, sicut mille anni*, non superposuit autem mille annos sed intra eos mortuus est, transgressionis adimplens sententiam." (C. H. v. 23. § 2.) Compare also Pseudo-Barnabas xv., αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, Ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα κυρίου (Cod. Sinait.; σήμερον ἡμέρα common text) ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

The use of the expression in Justin and in the latter passage from Irenaeus seems to shew an allusion to 2 Pet. iii., because the thought has to do with delay in mercy, so that we may account the longsuffering of the Lord to be salvation. It will be noticed that the words are introduced as a quotation: the Psalm reads in the LXX., ὅτι χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ἐχθὲς ἥτις διήλθεν, καὶ φυλακὴ ἐν νυκτί (xc. [lxxxix. LXX.] 4). 2 Pet. iii. 8 has ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. The form of the comparison ὡς χίλια ἔτη is the same in 2 Pet., but not so in the Psalm.

In the Epistle of Polycarp there is a passage which seems from the thoughts and words to be moulded on a sentence in this Epistle. He says to the Philippians, οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθεῖν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς γενόμενος ἐν ὑμῖν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων ἐδίδαξεν . . . ὃς καὶ ἀπὸν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς, κ. τ. λ. (c. iii.) καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἐν πασαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν. (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.)

In the first century Clement of Rome thus writes:—"On account of hospitality and godliness Lot was delivered out of Sodom, when all the region round about was condemned with fire and brimstone. The Lord made it manifest that He doth not forsake them that trust in Him; but those who turn to other ways He appoints to punishment." (cap. xi.) Let this, as to the connection of words and thoughts, be compared with 2 Pet. ii. 6-9: "Turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot. . . . The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." It certainly looks as if the one passage had been in the mind of the writer of the other.

A passage from an Oration of Melito "in the presence of Antoninus Caesar," preserved in a Syriac translation from a Nitrian MS., was edited in 1855 by the late Dr. Cureton, in his *Spicilegium Syriacum*, together with an English version. The genuineness of this work of Melito has been oppugned, partly, if not mostly, on account of an allusion which it appeared to contain to 2 Pet. iii. 5-7 in speaking of judgment to come. The passage ought to be compared: for there is no good ground for denying the genuineness of the work. Melito, after speaking of those who have

entered into God's unchangeable covenant, says: "These same will be able to escape from being consumed when the flood of fire shall come upon all the world. For there once was a flood and wind, and the chosen men were destroyed by a mighty north wind, and the just were left for demonstration of the truth: but again at another time *there was a flood of waters*, and all men and living creatures were destroyed by the multitude of waters, and the just were preserved in an ark of wood, by the ordinance of God. So also will it be at the last time; *there shall be a flood of fire*, and the earth shall be burnt up, together with its mountains, and men shall be burnt up together with the idols which they have made, and with the graven images which they have worshipped; and the sea, together with its isles, shall be burnt; and the just shall be delivered from the fury, like their fellows in the ark from the waters of the deluge." (Spicilegium Syriacum, Syr. text p. 30. Eng. trans. 50, 51.) It was pointed out by Cureton (p. 94) that the former part of the extract from Melito is based on a passage quoted by Josephus from the third Sibylline book<sup>k</sup> relative to the tower of Babel:—

καὶ βούλονται ἀναβῆναι εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα·  
αὐτίκα δ' ἀθάνατος μεγάλην ἐπέθηκεν ἀνάγκην  
πνεύμασιν· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἀνεμοὶ μέγαν ὕψοθι πύργον  
ῥέψαν, καὶ θνητοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις ἔριω ᾤρσαν. (100-103.)

And hence it has been thought that the description of the future flood of fire may be taken from a *previous* passage in the same book (as it now exists):—

καὶ πέσεται πολύμορφος ὄλος πόλος ἐν χθονὶ διὰ  
καὶ πελάγει· ῥεύσει δὲ πυρὸς μαλεροῦ καταράκτης  
ἀκάματος, φλέξει δὲ γαῖαν, φλέξει δὲ θάλασσαν,  
καὶ πόλον οὐράνιον, καὶ ἥματα, καὶ κτίσιν αὐτὴν  
εἰς ἐν χωνεύσει καὶ εἰς καθαρὸν διαλέξει. (83-87.)

But the connection with 2 Pet. in Melito is shewn by the contrast drawn in each between the flood of waters and the future destruction by fire: also the passage that speaks of the fire is no original part of the third Sibylline; and thus no reliance can be placed on it as having belonged to the book in the time of Melito<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> The proofs of the third Sibylline book being for the most part that which was written by a Jew in the form of a prophecy about 170 or 160 B. C. are given in Friedlieb's edition, pp. xxxviii., xxxix.; and they are translated from him by Dr. Pusey in "Daniel the Pro-

phet," p. 363. *This* is the book quoted by Virgil in his fourth Eclogue.

<sup>1</sup> As the Sibylline Books have been used to explain away the allusion in the passage from Melito to 2 Pet., there are two places in two of these books, both of which appear to have been

But in Tertullian no real trace can be found of this Epistle. This only proves how little general circulation some of the uncollected Catholic Epistles had. If Tertullian's *Scorpiace* had perished, or if two leaves of that work had not come down to us, we might have argued on his ignorance of St. Peter's first Epistle. Let this sparing use of the first Epistle (which was "universally received") illustrate his entire silence as to the second.

The argument on Tertullian's silence as to 2 Pet. might be strengthened, if it were proved that the *Scorpiace*, in which alone he cites 1 Pet., were not genuine. But until I know the reasons of Volkmar and others for denying or doubting this, I continue to believe it to be truly the work of that writer, and I do not argue on a silence as to 1 Pet., which I believe does not exist. I only remark that Volkmar and others weaken their own rejection of 2 Pet., by asserting that Tertullian did not use that Apostle's former Epistle.

By the latter part of the third century all the seven Catholic Epistles had been formed into a collected volume, which was appended to the book of Acts: we find from the collections of Euthalius (first deacon of Alexandria and afterwards bishop of Sulca, ἐπισκόπου Σούλκης—a locality which seems uncertain) that Pamphilus the martyr was the author of an arrangement of the book of Acts in chapters; and from the subscription appended to the Euthalian copy of the Catholic Epistles, it appears pretty evident that he did the same with regard to them: for the subscription says, ἀντεβλήθη δὲ τῶν Πράξεων καὶ Καθολικῶν Ἐπιστολῶν τὸ βιβλίον πρὸς τὰ ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου, thus uniting the Catholic Epistles with the Acts: of the latter book, the Prologue published by Zacagni (*Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum, Romae* 1698, p. 428) is shewn to be the work of Pamphilus (*Montfaucon, Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 78); and everything leads to the persuasion that all up to this subscription is the work of Pamphilus as well as the Prologue<sup>m</sup>.

written in the second century A. D.: which seem to shew an acquaintance with this part of this Epistle.

καὶ τότε δὴ ποταμός θ' ὁ μέγας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο  
ρεύσει ἀπ' οὐρονόθεν, καὶ πάντα τόπον δαπανήσει,  
γαῖάν τ', ὠκεανόν τε μέγαν, γλαυκὴν τε θάλασσαν,  
λίμνας καὶ ποταμούς, πηγὰς, καὶ ἀμείλιχον ᾄδην,  
καὶ πόλον οὐράνιον. (ii. 196–200.)

αἱ αἶ σοι, τλήμων, αἱ αἶ, κακόθυμε θάλασσα,  
βρωθήσῃ πυρὶ πᾶσα καὶ ἐξολέσεις λαὸν ἄλμῃ·  
ἔσται γάρ τε τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ μαινόμενον πῦρ,  
ὅσσον ὕδωρ ρεύσει, καὶ ἐξολέσει χθόνα πᾶσαν.

φλέξει ὄρη, καύσει ποταμούς, πηγὰς δὲ κενώσει,  
ἔσται κόσμος ἄκοσμος, ἀπολλυμένων ἀνθρώπων.  
καίόμενοι δὲ κακῶς τότε τλήμονες ἐμβλέψουσιν  
οὐρανόν, οὐκ ἄστροις, ἀλλ' ἐν πυρὶ κεκμηῶτα.

(vii. 118–125.)

The writers of these lines surely read 2 Pet. iii.

<sup>m</sup> It was long thought that Euthalius was rather an author than a collector; and on this supposition there were several passages which presented considerable difficulty; for instance, that in which the author calls himself νέον χρόνων καὶ μαθημάτων; and one in which he says,

Such, then, are grounds of evidence yet extant, giving us so far proofs of what led the Church in the fourth century to receive the second Epistle of Peter. And besides what we have, we must remember that *then* there were sources of information, accessible to inquirers, to which we cannot have recourse. So that Eusebius, in the former part of that age, could say that though some objected to this Epistle, it was one τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὁμῶς τοῖς πολλοῖς. (H. E. iii. 25<sup>n</sup>.)

If the evidence in favour of this Epistle appears to be scanty, we have to inquire whether it is *good*; and if so, the question is rather, Why should we not receive it? than, What difficulties and objections can we find?

Now it will be observed, that the real grounds of objection are internal; and they have far more to do with subjective feeling than with facts or evidence. It is said that the style and phraseology differ greatly from the first Epistle: that in the second century St. Peter's name was used for forgeries: that the allusion in chap. iii. to St. Paul and his Epistles marks a later age: that the use of so much of Jude's Epistle in chap. ii. is inconsistent with this being apostolic. The utmost that these objections can amount to is *supposition*; and a supposition, however probable, falls before even the smallest amount of evidence. But perhaps on examination these very grounds of objection will furnish heads of argument in favour of the authenticity of this Epistle.

i. The resemblance of chap. ii. to Jude is most marked: now would a forger in the name of the Apostle Peter thus use the writing of a person of far less note, as that which he would quote and use? Would he not avoid what would lead to such an objection?

after the year 490, that he was νέος ἀμαθὴς ἐρήμην ὁδὸν καὶ ἀτριβῇ ἵέναι προστάγμενος: these words appeared very unintelligible, when it was remembered what an ecclesiastical position Euthalius held at the time of the council of Chalcedon (451), and what his literary labours in 458. The unsatisfactory solutions of these difficulties fell to the ground when it was seen from the Prologue published by Montfaucon, that he simply used the words of others. In Horne's Introduction (1856), vol. iv. 26-28, the subject is discussed, and the proofs are given of the non-originality of Euthalius as a writer. Had I remembered how Routh (*Reliquiae*, iii. 510) had pointed out that Pamphilus was the author of the Prologue to the Acts, it would have saved me much trouble, though at the expense

of having had the discipline of an original investigation.

<sup>n</sup> It has been argued that as some have spoken of St. Peter's first Epistle simply as *his Epistle*, "Petrus ait in epistola sua" (*Iren.* C. H. iv. 9. § 2), it assumes that but one was known; but this is the mode in which St. John's first Epistle is also quoted. Indeed we subsequently find, when both the Epistles of Peter were fully known, the same phrase applied to the second; ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς πρῶτον τὸν νόμον φωτίζων ὡς ἐν λύχνῳ παραφαίνοντι, ὡς φησιν Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, Προσέχοντες . . . ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. *Epiph. Haer.* lxvi. 64. (*Petav.* i. 678. *Dind.* iii. 90.) No one, I suppose, would argue from this that Epiphanius knew nothing of 1 Pet.

ii. If a person in the second century wrote in the name of St. Peter, would he have inserted a reference to St. Paul and his Epistles which causes difficulty? For it seems from the reference to be quite uncertain which Epistle of St. Paul is meant, and the allusion is by no means clear.

iii. While it is true that in the second century teaching was attributed to St. Peter that was not his, it needs only to compare this Epistle with the Homilies attributed to him in the Clementines, to see the utterly different tone of thought and feeling. And if it were said that this Epistle was written in opposition to the Homilies, we may easily see that there are points uncontradicted which lie at the base of the whole system of that book. Now the doctrine of the Clementines, as put into the mouth of Peter, is that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses; that it contains a great mixture of error, introduced by Satan, while the law was preserved by tradition. The fall of Adam is denied, also that sacrifice had been ordained of God. The dislike to St. Paul and his teaching is very decided. If this Epistle were intended as a contradiction of the Homilies, we might reasonably expect some assertion of the fall, of the authority of the Law, and of the divine institution of sacrifice. If it be thought that iii. 15, as referring to St. Paul, was introduced for a purpose, it might be asked how then it is not more full and definite, and how is it that such prominence is given in ver. 16 to the difficulties in his Epistles? ἐν αἷς, referring to Epistles, is undoubtedly the reading much better supported than ἐν οἷς°. If this Epistle were forged to controvert the Clementines, would not the *intention* be far more manifest?

iv. Does the difference of style in any way shew that the second Epistle of Peter had a different author from the first? Let the answers of Jerome to such questionings be borne in mind. “Simon Petrus . . . scripsit duas epistolas, quae catholicae nominantur; quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam.” (De Vir. Ill. 1.) “Denique et duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri, stylo inter se et caractere discrepant structuraque verborum: ex quo intelligimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus.” (Ad Hedibiam, Ep. 120. 11.) One thing that affects the style of a work is its subject-

° It is worthy of inquiry, whether the Clementine Homilies do not afford evidence amounting at least to a probability of the prior existence of 2 Pet. having been known by the writer. When we read ἔχετε γὰρ τοῦ πάλαι κατακλυσθέντος κόσμου τὸ ὑπόδειγμα (ix. 2. p. 93. ed. Lagarde), it at least calls to mind ὁ τότε κόσμος

ἔδει κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπόλετο (2 Pet. iii. 6), and also κατακλυσμὸν κόσμου ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας . . . ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς. (ii. 5, 6.) There are several things in the Clementine Homilies which seem rather to be directed against 2 Pet. than *vice versâ*.

matter. Occasionally a work may be known to be written by a particular author, or else it may be judged to be a studied imitation of his style and manner, from the expressions, the arrangement, and the kind of illustrations and mode of reasoning; and when there are particulars which would *not* be imitated, or they appear in such a manner as to be clearly undesigned, the identification may be regarded as very certain. But the supposed converse to this will not hold good. When a person is writing on subjects wholly different, and at another time, it would be strange to expect uniformity of mere style. As well might stern and solemn rebuke be couched in the language of gentle entreaty. If Peter preaching in the Acts, if his addresses to Ananias and Sapphira and to Simon Magus, and his answer before the Jewish council, be compared with the different parts of this Epistle, they will be found to accord with it far more as to *style*, than they do with the first Epistle, the genuineness of which is incontrovertible.

It may be observed, that the name *Symeon* Peter is that which introduces this Epistle: would a forger use a peculiar form of the Apostle's name, which is nowhere else given him in the New Testament, except by James in Acts xv. 14?

This Epistle is either the genuine work of the Apostle, who is professedly the author, or else it is a solemn imposture<sup>p</sup>. Let the Epistle itself be read; let its words be considered; and then let it be said if it does not carry with it an impress of perfect truthfulness. It professes to be the work of an Apostle, and thus it is in vain to argue (as some have done) that the author writes *avowedly* that the Apostles were dead, resting on ch. iii. 2.

Few moral arguments in favour of this Epistle can be stronger than that derived from the prediction, iii. 3, 4, that scoffers should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts, and saying, "Where is the promise of His coming?" men who are willingly ignorant that the old world was destroyed by the water of the flood.

Throughout the second century there are traces of this Epistle having

<sup>p</sup> The case is wholly different from that of an anonymous work, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the authorship, and not the canonical authority, is the matter in question. We may compare the case of the anonymous books of the Old Testament with the book of the prophecy of Isaiah, which in the title professes to be his, and which is quoted as his by

our Lord and his Apostles, especially in those parts which modern scepticism would ascribe to a later author. See Mat. iii. 3; Mark i. 2, 3; Luke iii. 4, &c.; John i. 23; Matt. viii. 17; John xii. 38; Rom. x. 17, 20; Luke iv. 17. Also in Acts viii. 28 we have the testimony of one who was not an Apostle.

been known and used<sup>9</sup>. In the third century it comes to us with testimony from the region to which it is addressed; and from that age and onward it is well known. Meanwhile a book, called the Apocalypse of Peter, is known and used by many. These are *facts*; and I believe that they admit of a simple explanation. My belief is, that this second Epistle was sent to the East shortly before the martyrdom of the author; that in other countries it was not much circulated, only its prophetic character had been heard of by those who themselves had never read it; as it was an Apocalyptic book, the so-called Apocalypse of Peter was circulated in some countries in its stead, either as then written, or as appending the Apostle's name to something previously existing. I cannot suppose the forged Apocalypse of Peter to have gained any acceptance, save from the fact having been known that that Apostle had written a prophetic book.

§ 4. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. The introductory words of the Epistle of Jude, in which he calls himself "Judas, the brother of James," seem to imply that those to whom he wrote had been addressed by the James of whom he spoke; otherwise the name would imply nothing definite.

In the third century Origen speaks of this Epistle as that which is circulated as that of James: *ἐὰν γὰρ λέγῃται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ νεκρά ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστόλῃ ἀνέγνωμεν.* (in Johan. xix. iv. p. 306.) Besides quotations in his works, which we only have in a Latin translation of doubtful accuracy, we have the following: *ὡς παρὰ Ἰακώβου, ὥσπερ δὲ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν.* (ii. 644.) *διὸ καὶ ἐλέχθη ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν.* (ii. 124.) It was clearly at that time a book in use, but not very well known; which might well be the case, from its being addressed to believing Israelites as such (those of the twelve tribes scattered abroad, who believed on our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory), and not to any particular country, and from its not being part as yet of any recognized collection.

Irenaeus says, "Et quia non per haec justificabatur homo sed in signo data sunt populo, ostendit, quod ipse Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observatione sabbatorum credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est." (C. H. iv. 16. § 2.) He thus shews his acquaintance with James ii. 23, although in his extant writings he does not mention this Epistle by name. In another place (v. i. § 1), "factores autem sermonum

<sup>9</sup> An argument against this Epistle has been based on its absence from the old Syriac version: all that can be said is, that this Epistle, as well as 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apoca-

lypse, were not contained in the collection so translated: for of these books, the Apocalypse was in the second century undisputed.

ejus facti," and "facti autem initium facturæ," appear to be an allusion to James i. 18, 22.

Before this we have proof of this Epistle having been known. The allusions in the Shepherd of Hermas shew the same tone and connection of thought, so as to make it very evident that he *must* have been acquainted with this Epistle.

The following are instances of this use: δύναται γὰρ ὁ διάβολος παλαῖσαι, καταπαλαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται. ἐὰν οὖν ἀντιστῇς αὐτόν, νικηθεὶς φεύγεται ἀπὸ σου κατησχυμμένος. (Mand. xii. 5.) Compare James iv. 7. μᾶλλον φοβήθητι τὸν κύριον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι. (ibid. 6<sup>s</sup>.) Compare James iv. 12.

Having thus traced this Epistle backward from the time of Origen, it may be noticed that his younger contemporary, Dionysius of Alexandria, in his extant Remains quotes this Epistle twice: ὁ γὰρ θεός, φησι, ἀπειραστός ἐστι κακῶν. (pp. 32 and 33, ed. Rom. 1796, and in Mai, N. Biblioth. Patrum, vi. 166.) πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν. (p. 200, ed. Rom.<sup>1</sup>)

After this time this was placed first in the collection of the Catholic Epistles; and in the earlier part of the fourth century it was reckoned amongst the Antilegomena, known by most, but objected to by some.

§ 5. THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE FOURTH CENTURY. In order rightly to understand the distinction of the Books in the beginning of the fourth century into those "universally received" and those "objected to by some," we must consider some of the circumstances of the Christians in that age.

Events had occurred which rendered it needful for the Church to discriminate accurately between its authoritative Scripture and other books. The Diocletian persecution, which commenced in the year 303, was directed even more against the sacred books of the Christians than against their persons. The endeavour was made to exterminate the Christian Scriptures: had this effort succeeded, it was thought that the form of belief which hindered the disciples of Christ from uniting in the popular idolatries, would at once fall to the ground. Such an effort had been made by Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the Old Testament, and thus to annihilate Judaism.

\* "The coincidences of Hermas with St. James are too numerous to be enumerated at length. Whole sections of the *Shepherd* are framed with evident recollection of St. James's Epistle, e. g. *Vis.* iii. 9, *Mand.* ii. ix. xi, *Sim.* v. 4." Westcott, p. 175, *foot-note*.

<sup>a</sup> The text is thus quoted in Pseudo-Athanasius ad Antiochum: in the MS. at Leipsic there is, δύναται ὁ διάβολος ἀντιπαλαῖσαι, καταπα-

λαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται. ἐὰν οὖν ἀντισταθῇτε αὐτῷ, νικηθεὶς φύγεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν κατησχυμμένος, and φοβήθητε τὸν πάντα δυνάμενον σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι.

<sup>†</sup> The fact of this Epistle being contained in the old Syriac version is a strong argument in its favour: for while nothing can be concluded from the absence of an Epistle like 2 Peter, much is shewn by the positive fact of this being found there.

In the Diocletian persecution, the Christians throughout the Roman Empire, from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, from the cataracts of the Nile to Britain, were required to give up their copies of the New Testament to be destroyed: those who refused suffered imprisonments, tortures, slavery, or death. Many refused to surrender the Scriptures, and endured the consequences; others complied with the order of the Emperors, and thence received, amongst Christians, the designation of *Traditors*, as though they had betrayed the word of God, just as Judas had betrayed our blessed Lord Himself. There were also some who allowed the emissaries of the government to take away any books which were *not* Scripture: some bishops placed books of the heathens or of heretics where the messengers of the magistrates were likely to search for copies of the Gospels. Indeed not a few of those employed by the persecutors had but little zeal in the cause, so that they willingly took away whatever books were delivered to them, without inquiring whether they were the Christian Scriptures or not.

In consequence of this persecution, and the light in which the *Traditors* were regarded as subject to severe ecclesiastical discipline, it became really an anxious question, *What* are the sacred books of the Christians? Hence the need of discrimination on this point. Whoever gave up any of the books universally received was a *Traditor*,—whoever gave up any of the books reckoned as spurious was not subjected to any ecclesiastical discipline; but from the general feeling of the many, those who gave up the books opposed by some, would be looked on with doubt, and by most would be regarded as *Traditors*. The importance of the question was felt as widely as the diffusion of the Christian name<sup>u</sup>.

Hence the statement of Eusebius as to the books universally received, those opposed by some, and those altogether spurious. Besides the two *collections*,—the Gospels,—and the thirteen Epistles with St. Paul's name, the first class consisted only of the Acts, 1 Peter, 1 John, and perhaps the Apocalypse.

The other books of the New Testament would belong to the second class; and the spurious would be those which were known to be forgeries, or uninspired later writings<sup>x</sup>.

The general acceptance of the books of the New Testament in the time

<sup>u</sup> This reference to the Diocletian persecution, in the three paragraphs above, I give in the words in which I stated the point in a Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the New Testament, printed in 1852.

<sup>x</sup> It is needless to discuss any of the contradictory or inconsistent statements given by Eusebius, as to the Epistle to the Hebrews especially. He records the varying opinions.

of that persecution shews how they were estimated as a question of life or death. It is worthy of remark, that when the peace of the Church was restored, so that Christians from land to land could have free intercourse, all the twenty-seven books were accepted as we accept them; and though as to some the amount of evidence is less than that which attests others, no subsequent investigation has disproved in any respect the judgment of the Church of the fourth century as to the Canon of the New Testament.

The records of Christianity are often assailed: this is not in general done by any examination of evidence, unless indeed with regard to some of the books that were less known; and then the attempt is made to pursue an apparent advantage, by reducing all historical evidence to a kind of uncertainty. We meet with bold assertions, such as recent statements relative to St. John's Gospel<sup>y</sup>; with attempts to decry all Historical Proofs; or with the repetition of what some eminent man or scholar has said<sup>z</sup>.

It is remarkable that the opinion of any destructive critic (especially if a German) is quoted and re-quoted, as if it were conclusive; while at the same time whatever upholds the authority of Holy Scripture (whether written by Germans or others) is kept comparatively out of sight, or is spoken of as if it were unworthy of discussion or serious consideration. But we have to do not with names or opinions, but with *facts* proved to be such. No searcher after Truth casts doubt and uncertainty on that which rests on clear and certain proofs.

Hence we may see the importance of the Historic evidence of Christianity: for although the external holding fast of the books of

<sup>y</sup> Three sentences in the first chapter of this Gospel contain doctrines, some or all of which are rejected by those who cast doubt on this Gospel itself, and deny or keep out of sight the evidence, by which it is so supported, "ut hinc dubitare dementis sit" (to use the words of Augustine):

"The word was God." ver. 1.

"The word was made flesh." ver. 14.

"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." ver. 29.

But although the Godhead, Incarnation, and Vicarious Sacrifice of our Lord, have an especial prominence in St. John's Gospel, these points are not peculiarities of his teaching. Do we not find the same doctrines in another Apostle—St. Matthew? Have those who press the different view (as they call it) of the Lord Jesus in the fourth Gospel so strongly, ever

remembered that the first occurrence of the word God in the first Gospel applies to Jesus Christ?

"Thou shalt call His name JESUS, for HE (αὐτός) shall save His people from their sins." i. 21.

"They shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us" (μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός). ver. 23.

"The Son of man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many." xx. 28.

"This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." xxvi. 28.

<sup>z</sup> Or, it may be, has *not* said: see Archdeacon Hare's remarks on what Luther is *said* to have said about some books of the Old Testament, in Vindication of Luther against his recent English Assailants, pp. 219-225.

Holy Scripture does not give spiritual apprehension of their use and value as able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, they are the basis of the truth which has to be spiritually known, and they contain the records given forth by the authority of the Holy Ghost.

Christianity as a Divine Revelation has other proofs as well as the Historical on which to rest: but as long as Historic Evidence remains unshaken, so long will the religion of the New Testament be unassailable.

---





Bib.Lit  
C

Canon Muratorianus

5852

Canon Muratorianus; ed. Tregelles.

DATE.

Nov. 25/54  
Jan. 4/58

NAME OF BORROWER.

J. S. M. Woodman

University of Toronto  
Library

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C  
39 13 12 09 07 021 6